A

IUST DISCHARGE

TO Dr. STILLINGFLEET'S

VNJVST CHARGE OF

IDOLATRY AGAINST

THE CHURCH OF ROME.

WITH

A Diſcovery of the Vanity of his late Defence,

In his Pretended Anſwer to a Book

Entituled

CATHOLICKS NO IDOLATERS

By way of Dialogue

Between { *EVNOMIVS, a Conformiſt* & *CATHARINVS, a Non-Conformiſt.*

THE FIRST PART.

Concerning the Charge of Idolatry, &c.

Facile eſt cuiquam videri reſpondiſſe, ſi tacere noluerit. S. Aug.

Rom: Belaſyſe

PARIS,

Printed for RENE' GUIGNARD, at the ſign of S. Baſil, in S. Jacques Street

M. DC. LXXVII.

Avec Privilege du Roy.

pr: 4s 6.

THE PUBLISHER TO THE READER

THE PUBLISHER TO THE READER

THe *Design* of these *Dialogues* discovering it self in the *Title Page*, and the *Particular Subjects* they treat of being set down in the Summary annexed, and the *Table* at the End, superseede the troubling the Reader with any *long Preface*. I shall therefore only touch briefly upon some few things, which I conceive his *Curiosity* would lead him to demand, if he knew of whom.

The First is concerning the *Author*; who he is, and it is his desire that his *name* should be concealed, not to put the Dr. into the *Temptation* of giving *him* a *like* occasion of *complaint*, as he had done formerly to T G when having gotten the knowledge of his being the *Author* of a certain *private Paper* in answer to some Objections *Cath. ut Idol. Preface*

made by him, he published the said Paper in Print with such Characteristical notes of the Author, as might easily discover who he was, and in terms so invidious, as were apt to create the greatest Prejudice against him.

The Second is, what *determin'd* the *Author* to make choice of this way of *Dialogue* between a *Conformist* and a *Non-Conformist*, and I have heard him say, it was Dr St's constant acting of both *parts* in his Writings without any manner of *Retractation*; and no *Method* seemed more apt to make the Reader sensible of this *Artifice*, than to distribute the *Parts* to the *Proper Persons*, and make *each rehearse* for himself.

The Third is the *Style*, in which if the Dr chance to meet with *some* of those which he calls *hard words*, and which he saith *he is so used to, that he can easily pass them over*, yet in case this good *Resolution* should fail him, he can have no *just reason* to complain, *they* being either *All* or the *greatest* part of them as appears by the *Citations* in the Margent, *transcribed* from his own *Original*, and but the *Echos* of his own *Reproaches*. And I doubt not, but the

Def. p. 40.

Reader after he hath considered all things, will find them to be much beneath the merits of his *Intolerable Vapouring* without cause, and the bitter *Sarcasms*, with which he treats T. G. who for the *moderation* used by him in his *Reply* had gained the repute of a *Civil* and *modest Adversary* in the judgment of many *Learned men* of the *Church* of *England*.

The Fourth is, why some *Passages* are more *largely* insisted on in this Treatise, which the Reader perhaps will think did not deserve the *Pains* that is bestowed on them, and particularly that *Religious* Question concerning the *Heathen's Jupiter*, *whether according to the Fathers he were the true God or a Devil*? But the *great advantage* the Dr thinks it to be to his *Cause*, to maintain him to be the *true God*, and the discussing this Point to be so *very material towards the true Understanding the nature of Idolatry*, as to deem it worth the while to spend a *hundred* and *twelve Pages* in giving a *full account* of the *Sense* of the *Fathers* concerning it, is to be considered, as also his unreasonable *triumphing* over his Adversary for having asserted *Jupiter* Def. p. 14

according to the *Fathers*, to be a *devil*: and the *Impression* all this must make upon an unwary Reader, together with the *great abuse* he puts upon the *Fathers* by *misrepresenting* their Sense, and *corrupting* their words. as is shown in the *Third Part* of this Treatise *Dial.* 3.

The last is, how it can be expected, that a litle *Anonymous Book* in 12° of 500 Pages should ever passin the world for a *Just Answer* to a *Volume* of *Dr Stillingfleet's* in large 8vo consisting of neer 900. in which the *Citations* too are without *number*, the *Arguments* without *measure*, and the *Discourses* or rather *Excursions* without *end*. But for *that* I must referr the Reader to the *Treatise* it self, in which he will find all the *material* difficulties of the Dr's *Defence* relating to the *Charge* of *Idolatry*, proposed in his own words with their *due Strength* and *light* (and often times with advantage) by *Catharinus*, and fully refuted by *Eunomius*. T'is not *Noise* and *Bulk* which make an *Answer*, but *Truth* and *Reason*. For as *S. Augustin* saith *Quid est loquacius vanitate?* *Quæ non ideo potest quod Veritas, quia si voluerit, etiam plus potest clamare*

li. 5. de Civ. Dei c. ult.

quam Veritas. There is nothing so full of words as Vanity: Yet we are not therefore to think, that Vanity can do what Truth does, because if it be resolv'd not to hold it's peace, it can make a greater Noise, than Truth it self.

A SUMMARY OF

The Chief matters contained in these Dialogues.

In the First Part.

THE *Charge* of *Idolatry* shown *Unmaintainable* by *Dr Stillingfleet.*

Dial. 1. 1. Without *dissenting* from the *Sense* of the *True* and *Genuin Sons* of the *Church* of *England.*

Dial. 2. 2. Without *imposing* upon the 22th of the 39. *Articles*, a *Sense* never *intended* by the Compilers of them.

Dial. 3. 3. Without *denying* or *Assigning* a *distinct Church* in all Ages preserved from *Heresy* and *Idolatry*, with which *all Christians* were bound to join in *Communion.*

Ibid. p. 91, &c. 4. Without *granting* the *Church* of *Rome* to erre against a *Fundamental* Point of *Faith.*

Dial. 4. 5. Without bringing the *Guilt* and *Mischief* of the *Schism* upon the maintainers of the *Charge.*

Dial. 5. 6. Without subverting *all Lawfull Ecclesiastical Authority* in the *Church* of *England.*

In the

1. *What* Dr St hath *done* in his late *Defence*, shown to have been *un-neceſſary*, as to the greater part of it, in *Relation* to T. G. Dial. 1.

2. *What* it was he *ought* to haue *done* to maintain *his Charge* of *Idolatry*. viz Dial. 2.

1st To haue laid down the *true Notion* of *Idolatry* in the nature of the thing, which he hath *not* done,

And then 2ly to haue shown how *it* agreed to the *doctrine* of the *Church* of *Rome* in her *Councils*, viz Dial. 3.

1 The *Second Nicene*.

2ly And *that* of *Trent*. In *both* which he is shown to haue *failed*; as alſo in the *Parallel* he draws from the *Practice* of the *Arians*. Dial. 4. Ibid. p. 247.

Some *Inſtances* of his *unfaithfull reporting* the words and ſenſe of *Authors* cited by him, tendred to Conſideration. Dial. 3. p. 220. Dial. 4. p. 234. 252.

In the Third Part.

1. The *Queſtion* is ſtated concerning the *Heathen's Jupiter*, whether according to the *Fathers*, he were the *true God* or a *Devil*? The *latter* proved by more than a *whole Jury* of them. Dial. 1.

2. The greateſt part of the *Teſtimonies* produced by Dr St shown to be *Imper-* Dial. 2.

tinent, (together with a short yet clear *Account* of the *Heathens Theology* out of the *Fathers*) and

Ib. p. 330

Dial. 3. 3. Those *Testimonies* which seem most *Expresse* to be *mis-represented* or *corrupted by him.*

Dial. 4. 4. The *Parallel* he draws from the *Practice* of the *Vulgar Heathens* shown to be *Vnjust*, with another *Instance* of his *unfaithfull reporting* of a Passage of *Thomas Aquinas.*

Ib. p. 359

Dial. 5. 5. As also his *other Parallel* from the *Practice* of the *Wiser Heathens.*

Ib. p. 447. &c 6. The Argument from *God's Appropriation* of certain External Acts to his worship, shown to *conclude nothing* against the *Church* of *Rome*, And

Dial. 6. 7. *No succour* to be had to *his Cause* from the *determination* of *Circumstances* as assigned by him.

Ib. p. 488. 8. A *Just discharge* to his *Vnjust Charge* of *Idolatry* from the doctrine of *Mr Daillé* concerning the Vse of *Signs* Instituted by men.

Ib. p. 512 Lastly his *denying Christ himself* to be offered as a *Sacrifice* upon the *Altar*, shown to be *repugnant* to the *Sense* of the *true* and *Genuin Sons* of the *Church* of *England.*

XUM

ERRATA.

THe *English Press* being watch'd of late, as the *Orchard* of the *Hesperides* was of old, and a *necessity* arising from thence of making use of a *Paris Printer*, who understands not a word of *English*, the Reader will have no cause to wonder, if he sometimes meet with *an* for *and*, *bu* for *but*, *te* for *the*, *is* for *it*, *tit* for *tis*, *wish* for *with*, &c. and oftentimes with false Pointings, *words* unduly joined, and *syllables* un-artificially divided at the end of lines, as *Ro-me*, *appropria-te*, and the like. I can assure him, the *Correction* of the *Press* cost little less *paines*, than the *writing* of the Treatise. Yet was it not possible to avoid *all Errours*. The most *material* are here noted, and I desire the Reader's Candour in the *Amendment of them*.

In the First Part.

P. 33. in the Marg. for *244.* read *124.*
P. 40. l. 10. f. *nay* r. *may*. P. 54. l. 4. f. *sigh.* r. *sight* P. 68. l. 4. f. *et* r. *it*.
P. 71. l 15, f. *Hall* r. *Hell*. P. 92. l. 13. f. *his* r. *to his*. P. 101. l. 28. f. *shati* r. *that it*. P. 115. l. 7. f. *Prophani* r. *Profane*.
P. 123. l. 2. f. *Wit* r. *with*. P. 124. l. 6.

XUM

f. *ells* r. *tells*. Ibid. l. 7. f. *if* r. *of*.
P. 137. l. 3. f. *f* r. *if*. P. 139. l. 6. f. *who* r. *whom*. P. 150. l. 25. f. *Fspiter* r. *Jupiter*.

In the Second Part.

P. 170. l. 27. f. *Papisti* r. *Papists*.
P. 186. l. 23. f. *apon* r. *upon*. P. 188. l. 20. f. *the* r. *they*. Ibid. l. 26. f. 13.*th* r 13*th*.
P. 189. l. 20. f. *to* r. *as*. Ibid. l. 21. f. *forbidden* r. *forbidden as*. P. 190. l. 9. f. *Postulat's* r. *Postulata's*. P. 219. l. 19. f. *every* r *to every*.
P. 232. l. 14. f. *These* r. *There*.
P. 240. l. 15. f. *Auditros* r. *Auditors*.
Ibid. l. 25. f *Receptable* r. *Receptacle*.
P. 281. l. 28. f. *when* r. *whom*.

In the Third Part.

P. 291. l. 8. f. *being* r. *they are*.
P. 292. l 22. f. *haue* r. *haue not*.
P. 299. l. 3. f. *spirits* r. *spirit*.
P. 320. l. 17. f. *Po tical* r. *Poetical*.
P. 330. l. 26. f. *whom* r. (whom.
Ibid. l. 27. f. *heauen* r. *heauen*)
P. 242. l. ult. f. *to* r. *to be*.
P. 346. l. 14. f. *to weak* r. *so weak*.
Ibid. l. 22. f. *exatted* r. *exalted*.
P. 455. l. 21. f. *such* r. *such as*.
P. 497. l. 9. f. *it In like* r. *In like*.
P. 502. l. 20. f. *earnetly* r. *earnestly*.
P. 525. l. 24. f. *that* r. *than*.
P. 526. l. 20. f. *the. Wise* r. *the Wise*,

THE FIRST DIALOGVE.

THE ARGUMENT.

EVnomius declares his dis-satisfaction with the Charge of Idolatry, and Dr Stillingfleet's pretending it to be the Sense of the Church of England. The Dr's Endeavours in that part shewn to be Insufficient, particularly as to the Book of Homilies, and the Rubrick for kneeling at Communion. The sad account of History we are like to have from him, when he denies Robert Abbot Bishop of Salisbury to have been ever till now suspected for a Puritan. His charge of Idolatry different from that of the true and Genuin Sons of the Church of England; divers of whom vindicate the Doctrine of the Second Council of Nice concerning the worship of Images, from the note of Idolatry. The true State of the Controversy concerning that Point.

XUM

EVNOMIVS. CATHARINVS.

Evnomius: How does my good friend *Catharinus*? What, ever more poring upon Books? Me thinks, you should somtimes giue your self leaue to divert a litle. *Neq; semper arcum.*---

Cathar; Truly I think it much better to spend my time in reading *Sermons* and good Books of *Controversy*, than as Prophane men do now adays in *Playhouses* and *Taverns*.

Eunom: These I confess are but the too frequent *Employments*, rather than *Recreations* of the time. But do you never spend an hour in reading a *Play* or a *Romance*?

Cathar: It is not needfull. I have *Dr Stillingfleet's Books* of *Controversy*, which exceed them all not only in *Profit* but *Delight*: for he is the *man* in my mind, who *Omne tulit punctum, dum miscuit utile dulci.*

Eunom. But is there not something of *picquant*, as well as *dulce* in his writings, which perhaps makes them *rellish* the better with you? What you have before you, seems to me, by the *bulk* and fashion of the *Book*, to be his DEFENCE

of his Charge of *Idolatry* against the *Church* of *Rome*, in answer to T. G^s Book entituled, *Catholicks no Idolaters.*

Cathar. It is the very same: and I have read it over *once* with a great deal of *pleasure* and *satisfaction*, to see the *Heathens* could not be justly charged with *Idolatry*, bu the *Papists* must be so too: And am now *tasting* it over again, the *second* time.

Eun. Every one, as *Aristotle* saith, *iudgeth* (as wel as *tasteth*) *according as he is affected.* I have met with some who have been delighted with it too, at the first reading, but as we use to be with the strange *Adventures* and *Passages* in *Cassandra* or the *Grand Cyrus*; in which *Fiction* and *Truth* are so artificially interwouen, that men easily suffer themselues to be *Surpriz'd*, and then *please* themselues with the *surprise*. But Others there are, who look upon it, as an *Apology* rather for the *Heathens*, than a *Conviction* of the *Romanists*. And Others again, considering the *veneration* given to *Holy Things* and *Places* in the *Church* of *England*, and particularly to the *Altar* by Dr St. himself, are of opinion, that if the *Church* of *Rome* be guilty of *Ido-*

latry, for giving an *Honourary Respect* to the *Images* of *Christ* and his *Saints*, both *himself* and the *Church* of *England* must be in the same condemnation.

Cathar. By this I see, that for a man to write any thing in this age, especialy *Controversy*, is but to ly down and hold his *hand* for Every one to *Strike*. And to say the truth, his Adversaries have not been sparing to take their *turns*, and lay on as *hard* as they could. But notwithstanding *all their Rage and malice*, *he sits down*, he saith, *with that contentment, that He has defended a Righteous cause, and with an honest mind.* And therefore I hope you make a more favorable *Judgment* of his *Performance*.

Ep. Dedic.

Eun: To deal plainly with you, *Catharinus*, I was never *satisfied* with the *Charge* it self of *Idolatry*, against the *Church* of *Rome*, and much less with *Dr St's* endeauoring to *fasten* it upon the *Church* of *England* as her *Sense*; and till I be satisfied of these things, I must begg your pardon, if my *Judgment* be not the *same* with yours.

Cathar. I can not but wonder to hear this come from you, especially for what concerns the *latter* part of it, if you have

seriously considered the irrefragable *Evidences*, which Dr. *St.* produces, first in the *Preface* to his *Roman Idolatry*, and afterwards in his *Generall Preface*, (where he brings in the *Knight* himself encountring the *Dragon*) to prove it to be the *sense* of the *Church* of *England*. For although the *Knight* shew himself not inexpert in the *Art* of *Chivalry*, *by the buckling on his Armour; mounting his Steed, and according to all ancient and Modern pictures of the Combat, directing his lance into the very mouth of the dragon*, as *Dr St:* pleasantly describes him; yet the *Weapon* entred no further then the *Teeth*, and was there *Shivered* in a thousand peices. And for his *charging Dr St. with dissenting from the doctrin of the Church of England in accusing the Church of Rome of Idolatry*, t'is so notorious a peice of *disingenuous* dealing in him, that the *Dr desires the Reader by this one Instance to judge, what Candor and sincerity he is to expect in his Book*. *Gen: Preface.*

Eun: I have considered the *Peices* you mention over and over, and before I give you my thoughts of them, I must desire you, to consider me, as a *Person* perfect-

ly of *Mr Thorndike's Judgement* in this *matter*, and so to look upon the *Charge* of *Idolatry* against the *Church* of *Rome* not only as *groundless* and *Dangerous* in it self, but *Injurious* to the *Church* of *England*; and, consequently, what I shall say upon this subject, shall either be from the said *Mr Thorndike's* own *words*, or what I conceive *himself must* and *would* have *said* in conformity to his *Principles*. This premised, I must desire you to reflect, how *Dr St:* in the *Preface* to his *Roman Idolatry*, fearing the *Censure* of divers *learned* men of the *Church* of *England*, for *charging* so horrid a *crime* upon the *Mother Church* of the *English nation*, judged it stood him upon to order the matter so, that *he might not be thought in so severe a censure*, as that of *Idolatry*, *to contradict the sense of the Church of England*; (*which* he saith *he hath so great a regard to.*) And the way he takes to do it is to shew that *this charge of Idolatry hath been managed against the Church of Rome, by the greatest and most learned defenders of it, ever since the Reformation*, deeming *those* who *excuse* her from it, persons of *more charity than Judgment in so doing.*

and accordingly alledges in his behalf the *Book* of *Homilies* and the *Testimonies* of seventeen severall *Authors*.

His Adversary T. G to show the Dr had not proceeded *regularly* in the proof of what he undertook, first demands, if he have such a *regard*, as he saith, for the *Church* of *England*, why he did not *appeal* to her 39 *Articles*? For, as *Dr St.* himself saith of the *Sense* of the *Church* of *Rome that we are to appeal for it, not to the Testimonies of Particular Persons in that Church, but to the decrees of the Council of Trent.* So in like manner, for the *Sense* of the *Church* of *England* (*the same case*, as himself saith, *holding for Titius that doth for Sempronius*) He ought to have *appealed* to the publickly authorized *Articles* of that *Church*. But in them the *Church* of *England* declares no such thing as shall be shewed hereafter. *Rom Idol: p. 209.*

2. As for the Book of *Homilies*, T. G. cited divers *Eminent Divines* of the *Church* of *England* as *Bp Montague*, *Dr Heylin*, and *Mr Thorndike* who do not *allow* that *Book to contain in every part of it the publick dogmaticall doctrin of that Church*; and the last of them *Mr*

Thorndike instances particularly in the very *Homily* against Peril of *Idolatry*; of which he saith, *that in this particular he must have leave to think it fails, as it evidently doth in others.*

3. He excepted against litle leſſ than *two* parts of *three*, of the *seventeen* Authors produced by *Dr. St*, as *incompetent Witnesses* in the case, upon the account of being either *Puritans*, or *Puritanically inclined*; And although *Dr St.* call this a *frivolous exception*, Yet to doe T. G. *Justice*, and free him from *envy* in this particular, He took this *measure* from *Dr. St.* himself, who to make the *Testimony* of Ar. B^p *Whitgift* valid in his own cause, gives this for the Reason, because *none could be leſſ suspected to be Puritanically inclin'd than He*; which was to insinuate that even *suspition* of *Puritanism* was a *sufficient exception* in this case. And therefore in pursuance of this, T. G. shewd from the *Testimonies* not of *Roman*, but of *Protestant* Authors, that *Eleven* of the *Seventeen* were accounted *Puritans*, or *Puritanically inclin'd.*

Cathar: I took Good notice of that *Reason* of *Dr. St.* in his *first Preface*,

and how tenderly in his *Generall Preface* he handled that Point, as willing rather to *wave* the *exception* by pretty facetious artifices of *wit*, then repell it from the *Generality* of those *Eminent* Persons by a *Downright* denyall, out of the *affection* I hope he *bears* still to the *Cause* which had been *honoured* by such *learned* and *Godly Bps* as *Iewel*, *Downham*, *Vsher*, *the two Abbotts*, *Robert*, *and George*, *and Davenant*: all which I find *recorded* among many others by my good frind the *Patron Bonæ fidei* in the *Catalogue* he gives of *Prelats* in the *Church* of *England*, who have been *Puritans*, or *Puritanically inclin'd*. Dr. St. says indeed of *Robert Abbot*, that *he was never till now suspected for a Puritan*: but I understand him to speak with relation to his *Adversary* who had *mistaken* the *one* Brother for the *Other*, and so endeavoured to cast upon him the *Suspition* of *Puritanism*. But the Dr. has brought such a *new* recruit of *Testimonies*, to maintain his charge.---- *Spec. p.* 49.

Eunom: Hold there my good Friend; I pray *content* your self a while with this *sweet Bit*, and have a litle patience while I go on.

4. For the *other six* remaining Authors, cited by *Dr. St.* viz. *Dr. Jackson, Dr. Feild. Arch Bp Laud.* &c. T. G. evidenced from their very words alledged, that they did not *charge* the *Doctrine* of the *Church* of *Rome* in the *Council* of *Trent*, or the *practice*, as *conformable* to that *Doctrine* to be *Idolatry; but such things as they conceived to be great abuses in the practice of it*; and consequently that *they differed only as more and lesse in the same kind, from those other Learned Protestants*, of whom the Dr. Himself confesseth, that *they excuse the Church of Rome from Idolatry although not all who live in the Communion of it.*

Preface to Rom. Idol.

By all which it *appears* to me, that T. G. did not dispute *exprofesso*, whether it were the *sense of the Church of England, that the Church of Rome is guilty of Idolatry, or no? Nor* whether *Dr. St. dissented from the sense of his Church?* (as he calls it) but what he undertook to show was no more than that *two* parts of the' *Authors* there cited by the Dr. were *Puritans* or *Puritanically inclin'd*, by the Confession of other *Divines* of the *Church* of *England:* and

that therefore according to Dr. Sts. owne *measures* (if they were good) their *testimonies* were to be looked on as *incompetent* to *prove* what he *asserted*; And for the *other six*; that what *they charged* with *Idolatry*, was not the *doctrine* of the *Church* of *Rome*, but some things which they conceived to be great abuses in the practice of it.

This being the *true state* of that *Controversy* between *him* and his *Adversary* in that place, what *Ingenuity* was it in the Dr. to tell his Reader in his *Generall Preface* (as you said even now,) that T. G. *charged him with* absolute *Dissenting from the doctrin of the Church of England in accusing the Church of Rome of Idolatry*; and then *desiring his Reader by this one Instance, to iudg what Candour and sincerity he is to expect from T. G. in his Book*; where as what T. G *charged* him with was only, that *He* had not *proved* in the very *way* himself made choice of (as the best to do it) his *charge* of *Idolatry* to be *the receiu'd doctrine of the Church of England*, *if that were not to be taken* (as the Dr. himself insinuated) *from such as were known Puritans or to be Puritanically inclin'd*; and *his*

charge of *Idolatry* were not the *same* with *that* of the aforelaid *six Authors* in the places alledged by him; much leſſ if it were to be taken from the *ſentiments* of thoſe who are eſteem'd her *true* and *Genuin* ſons; who *excuſe the Church of Rome from Idolatry, although not all who live in the communion of it.* And upon this account me thinks with all due *reſpect* to Dr. St. T. G. might much better *deſire his Reader by this one Inſtance to judge what Candour and Sincerity he is to expect from him in his defence.* For to me it ſeems not the *Same*, to tell a Perſon, who brings *witneſſes* to atteſt his *Innocency*, that his *Witneſſes* are *exceptionable*, upon the account of *Friendſhip or Relation*, &c. or that they ſpeak not *home* to his *purpoſe*; And to *charge* him as *Guilty*. But by the way, I muſt tell you, I never thought it the greateſt *Sign* of *Innocency*, for a Perſon to be *over ſolicitous* to *prove* himſelf *not guilty*.

Cathar: I ſee very wel, that what T. G. aym'd at, was to ſhew the *way* the Dr. took to *prove* his *charge* of *Idolatry* to be the *Senſe* of the *Church* of *England*, not to be *Regular*, becauſe not from the

publikly authoriz'd *Articles* of that *Church*; and his *Witnesses* many of them to be *incompetent* by the *Test* the Dr *Himself* had given for the *Tryal* of *them*, as being *Puritans or Puritanically inclin'd*; and although I am satisfy'd my self that *they* were *so*, at least the most *Eminent* of them, yet I do not see, but as to any thing return'd by T. G. Dr. St. hath sufficiently removed that *exception* from them in his *Generall Preface*: and hath brought such *Authentick Testimonies* from *other* publick *Acts* and *Records* as evidently *prove* it to be the *Sense* of the *Church* of *England*.

Eunom: Nor can I see what *necessity* there is that T. G. should *Engage* himself *farther* in this *argument*, his *intention* being only (as I said) to shew, that Dr. St. had *not* sufficiently *proued* it to be the *Sense* of the *Church* of *England*, from the *Testimonies* he *then* produced, whateuer he *might* or *could* doe from *other Acts* or *Authors* of that *Church*, and so might leaue it to be *disputed* between *him* and his *Church* (if it be *His*) and hauing giuen *that* only as a *Preludium* of the *close arguing* of his *Aduersary*, betake himself to his *defence* against

the *Charge* of *Idolatry*, whether it were the *sense* of the *Church* of *England* or no. But because I see you *think*, the Dr. has sufficiently *acquitted* himself, as to T. G. *pray* let me hear some of the Principall *passages*, in which you *think* he has *done* it; and I shall candidly giue you my *sense* of them, for hitherto, I confess I am not *convinc'd* that it is the *Sense* of the *Church* of *England*, nor can I *wish* it may be *prov'd* so, the *Accusation* is so *foul*, so *extravagant*, and, as yet it appears to me, so *vniust*

Cathar: First then, what can you say to the *Book* of *Homilies*? The greatest *Exception* T. G. made, was why Dr. St. did not *appeal* for the *Sense* of the *Church* of *England* to her 39. *Articles*: And to this Dr. St. tells him, that the *Approbation of that Book was one of them.* Viz the 35. and that *they were subscribed by the Bishops and whole convocation*, A. D. 1571. *which they could never do*, he says, *with a good Conscience, if they beleived any great and considerable part of the doctrine therin contained, to be fals and dangerous.*

Eun: To the *first* part of this Viz; the *Approbation* of that *Book* T. G. in

his *Preface* answer'd, that *it doth not evince that Every particular doctrine contained in that Book is a Godly and wholsome doctrine*, citing for it the *Authorityes* of Bp. *Montagu*, and Dr. *Heylin*; and what comes yet more close, Mr. *Thorndike* confessing of that *very Homily* against *perill of Idolatry*, that *he must have leave to think it fails in this particular*, as he saith *it evidently doth in others*. And what gives great *force* to this *Answer* (though not taken *notice* of by Dr. St.) is what T. G. had said a litle before, that had the *Church* of *England* authoriz'd the *particular* doctrine of that *Homily*, as her *dogmaticall* doctrine, *these Persons by asserting and maintaining the contrary as Erroneous, had incurr'd Excommunication* ipso facto (*as appears by the Canons printed before the* 39. *Articles, set forth by Mr. Rogers*) which I never heard they were *charged* with.

As for the *other* Point of *appealing* to mens *thoughts* and *Consciences* in a matter of *subscription*, as he doth, when he saith *he hopes, it doth not evince that the subscribers did not think the main doctrine of any one Homily to be fals*, it is a very *hopefull Topick*, if we consider

what hath been *done and undone* in that *Kind* in the *Reigns* of Kg *Henry* 8. K. *Edw.* 6. Q. *Mary* and Q. *Elizabeth*, not to *speak* of *later* times. If this be all he hath to say for the *Book* of *Homilies*, Mr. *Thorndike*, whom himself *confesseth* to have been *a Man of Excellent Learning and great Piety* must in all likelyhood have *subscribed* the 39. *Articles* against his *conscience*, (which I shall never be brought to believe) when nevertheless he declared his *Judgment* to be, that the *Homily* against *Peril of Idolatry failed in this particular*. And till I hear *him* and his *Fellows condemned* for what they assert, I must have leave to think, that the bare alledging the *Fact* of *Subscription* to the 35. *Article* among the rest, is not *sufficient* proof, that the *contrary* to what they *judged* is the *dogmaticall Sense* of the *Church* of *England*, especially when speaking expressely in the 22. *Article* of the *Romish doctrine concerning Worshipping and Adoration of Images*, She gives it onely the name of a *vain thing* and a *fond Invention*.

Cathar: But Dr. St. goes on; and *shows the current doctrine of the Church ever since*

since the Reformation to have been agreable to this Homily of the Peril of Idolatry, from the *Injunctions* of K. *Edw.* 6. and Q. *Elizabeth*.

Eun: This he saw very well might be looked upon, as an *Effect* of *Heat* at the *first reformation*, and whereas he will not have vs think it was *only a sudden Heat*. I shall give you an account of the *progress* of it out of Dr. *Heylin*. *There was a time*, saith he, *when Q. Elizabeth beheld the Pope as her greatest Enemy, in reference to her Mothers Marriage, her own Birth and consequently her Title to the Crown of England: and many of the Books which were printed in and about that time, were full of bitterness and revilings against the Church of Rome it self, and all the divine Offices, ceremonies and Performances of it.* But after the *Crown* was setled vpon K. *James*, whose *Title* was vnquestionable both at *Rome* and *abroad*; the *dangerous consequences* of the *charge* of *Idolatry* vpon the *Church* of *Rome* began to be more *calmely* and *maturely* considered; and were so thoroughly *weighed* in the time of K. *Charles* I. that as the same *Heylin* saith *Arch. B. Land with equal diligence endea-*

Cyprian Angl. pag. 342 2. Edit.

voured by his decree, to hinder the reprinting of the said Books, as also of others containing Calvinian doctrines, that so the Church might rest in quiet, without any trouble or molestation in her self or giving offence to any other. Which evidently shows, that *that Party* never looked vpon the *Expressions* of *Idolatry* contained in those *Iniunctions*, as the *Dogmaticall Sense* of the *Church* of *England.*

Cathar: I know the *Heat* of this *charge* began to grow cool in processe of *time*, and together with it the *fervour* of the *Reformation.* But what can be said to the *Rubrick* in the 2d. *Liturgy* by Edw. *6. readmitted* of late into the the *Book* of *Communion:* in which *the Adoration of the Host is expressly called Idolatry?* That very Rubrick of which T. G. (saith Dr. St.) *according to his excellent Skil in the Offices of our Church, saith, it is not yet more than a dozen years since it was inserted into the Communion Book; which he might haue found aboue a* 100. *years before in the Book of Edw. 6.* The words are these, that *by kneeling at Communion no Adoration is intended or ought to be done*

either vnto the Sacramentall Bread and wine, there bodily receiued; or any Corporal Presence of Christ's Natural Flesh and Bloud: For the Sacramental Bread and wine remain ſtil in their very natural ſubſtances, and therefore may not be adored. For that were Idolatry to be abhorred of all Faithfull Chriſtians. And now what can be more plain, then that *the Adoration of the Hoſt is here expreſsly condemned as Idolatry?*

Eun: To this I answer that the *various* Fate of this *Rubrick*, firſt in not being annexed to the *Communion* Book till the 2d. *Liturgy* in the 5. of *Edw.* 6. and being *caſt* out again in the year 1562. vnder Q. *Elizabeth*, and ſo remaining for almoſt a 100. *years*, and then *re-admitted* again, is no *Eviction* to mee, that Dr. St's. *charge* of *Idolatry* is the *dogmaticall doctrine* of the *Church* of *England*; which although she affirm (Art. 28.) that *Tranſubſtantiation hath given occaſion to many Superſtitions*, yet doth she not charge it with *Idolatry*. And what cõfirms me more in this Judgment is that we know that Dr. *Taylor* and Mr. *Thorndk.* both maintain, that although they ſuppoſe thoſe of

the *church* of *Rome* to be *mistaken* in their *belief* of the *Elements* being *changed* into the *Body* and *Bloud* of *Christ*; yet they deny it follows from thence, that they are *Idolaters*, because the *Object of their Adoration is Christ the only true and Eternall God.* And I never heard *they* were looked upon as *Excommunicated Persons* for it, though they both lived a considerable time after this *Rubrick* was annexed, Dr *Taylor being* advanced to a *Bishoprick* and Mr. *Thorndike* publishing his *Just Weights and Measures* in the year 1662. that is, *two years* after the said *Rubrick* was *inserted*; in which *Book* he expressely maintains that *the worship of the Host in the Papacy is not Idolatry.* and gives this reason for it, *because they that worship the Host do not beleeve that the Elements remain; but beleeve our Lord Christ, the only true God hypostatically united to our flesh and Bloud to be there present in an especiall manner.* And your friend the *Patron Bonæ Fidei* declares his Judgment also to bee, that *it is not so much madness in the Romanists to adore the Lord JESUS under the Species of Bread and wine, as it is a grosse Errour in*

chap. 19

Prodr. t. 77.

them to believe that the Bread is changed into the Body of Christ. But then again, to tell you my own thoughts concerning the *Sense* of this *Rubrick*, as it now stands, I take the meaning of it not to be, the denying *Adoration* to be *due* in regard of *Christ's Body* being present *Spiritually* but *truly* in the *Sacrament*, (for this is asserted by *Bp Andrews*, *Præsentiam credimus non minus quam vos veram*, *Mr. Thorndike*, and other learned men of the *Church* of *England*) but only that *no adoration ought to be done to any Corporal Presence of Christ's Natural Flesh and Blood*, as the word *Corporal* is taken by *Dr Taylor* in his Treatise of the *Real Presence*, and by other Protestant Divines, to signify the *Natural*. (or as Dr. *Cosins* cals it, *Carnall*) *manner* of a Body's being *present*. And my Reasons are. First because the words in the 2d, *Liturgy* of *Edw. 6.* (inserted by some of *Calvins* disciples then prevailing) *No adoration ought to be done to any Real or Essential Being of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood*, are now *changed* in the present *Communion-Book*, into *any corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood. For*

Andr. Resp. ad Apol. Bellar. c. 1. Thornd Epil. p. 350.

either the *Corporal Presence* is here distinguished by them from the *Real* and *Essential*, or not. *If* not, why were the words *charged*? If it be, it is manifest that this *last Edition* of the *Rubrick* determins nothing expresly of the *Real and Essential Being of Christ's Naturall Flesh and Bloud*, nor of the *Adoration due* to it, but rather intimates that *Such a presence* may be the *Ground* of *Adoration*: the word *Corporal* supposing only for the natural Presence after a *grosse* and *Carnal* manner, as hath been said. And that the denying the Ceremony of kneeling at the participation of the Sacrament, *to be done in regard of any Real and Essential Being of Christs natural Flesh and Bloud, being found in that Rubrick was one of the reasons, why the whole Rubrick was expunged by the Revisors of the Liturgy in the beginning of Q. Elizabeth*. is expresly affirmed by Dr *Heylin* in his *Ecclesia Reformata*, *Q. Eliz* pag. 111. and that for this very reason, *not to give scandal or Offence to the Popish Party*, who though they maintain the *Body* of *Christ* to be *truly, realy and substantially present in the Eucharist*, yet they de-

ny it to be there *Corporaliter*, *Corporally*, as the word is understood to imply the *Natural manner* of a Body's Existence. 2*ly*. Because Dr. *Taylor* in his *Real Presence* p. 12. saith that when the word *Real Presence is denyed by some Protestants. it is taken for natural Presence, and not for Presence in rei veritate*, which is at large declared by Bp. *Cosins* ch. 2. of his *History* of *Transubstantiation* (which at the Entreaty of Friends he permitted to be printed a litle before his death) to be the *unanimous Beleif of all Protestants*. Lastly had T. G. said it was not more then a *Dozen* years since this *Rubrick* was *framed* and *deuised*, Dr. St. had had some reason to tax his *want of skill in the Offices of the Church of England*, but saying only as he did that *it was not more than a dozen years since it was inserted*, I doe not conceiue it to be so *improper* a speech as to deserue the *Ferula*, being spoken of a thing, which had been *cast out* by publick Authority at the reviewing and *correcting* the *Liturgy* in the year 1562. and had remaind so, for wel neer a 100. years, and then *put* in. *Bellarm de Euch. li. 1. c. 2.*

If the *Explication* I haue giuen of it's

meaning be not agreable to Dr. *Sts sense*, he may if he please, *impugn* it; but it will import him, as I suppose, to do it so, as not to undermine the Constant doctrine of the *Church* of *England* concerning the *Real Presence*, and leaue us nothing but pure *Zuinglianism* in place of it.

Cathar. I shall leaue that to the Dr. to make what he will or can of it; And proceed to a *Passage*, in which you neither will nor can deny, but that T. G. was *grosly out indeed*; viz, when he *mistook George Abbot* Arch Bp of *Canterbury*, for *Robert Abbot* Bishop of *Salisbury*, the *former* being neuer mentioned by Dr. St. and the *latter*, as he saith, *neuer till now suspected for a Puritan. But they of the Church of Rome* as the Dr. obserues vpon this passage, *haue a faculty of doing greater wonders, with five words, than changing a Bishop into an Arch Bp. And he hopes T. G. vnderstands the Church he is of, better than that he left, or els we are like to haue a sad account of History from him.*

Eun: This was a *terrible mistake* indeed of *one* Bishop for *another*, both

Brothers

Brothers and living at the *Same* time, as theſe *Abbots* were, and doubtleſſe deſerues ſuch a *Magiſteriall Animadverſion* aas the Dr. hath given vpon it, as tending to the *confuſion* of all *Hiſtory*; eſpecially if He of *Salisbury* cited by Dr. St. were not alſo *Puritanically inclined*.

Cathar: Dr. Still. expreſsly affirms it, that *he was neuer till now ſuſpected for a Puritan*. And I haue that eſteem for his *Skill* in *Hiſtory*, that I believe you will not *euince* the contrary.

Eun. And yet you cannot but know, that your friend the *Patron bonæ Fidei* alledged euen now by your ſelf recites the *two Abbots*, *Robert and George*, among thoſe of the *Hierarchy*, whoſe names are in your *Diptyeks*; and his *Book* was published a year *before* Dr. St. printed his *General Preface*. But to paſſe this by: Let vs hear the account Dr. *Heylin* giues of *Dr Robert Abbot* in his *Cyprianus Anglicus, when by the power and fauour of his Brother, then Biſhop of London, he was preferr'd to the Place of his Maties Profeſſor for Divinity; He was*, ſaith he, *a man of Eminent Learning, and a more moderate Calvinian* p. 61.

than either of his Predecessors in the matter of Predestination, but altogether depending on the will of his Brother, whom the Dr. cannot deny to have been *Deep dy'd* in the *Doctrine* of *Geneua*. The same Dr *Heylin* tells vs also a *passage* or *two* which sufficiently show the *temper* of this *Dr. Abbot*. For *vpon occasion of Dr. Laud's touching in his Sermon vpon the Presbyterians and their proceedings, and vsing some words to this effect*, viz, *that the Presbyterians were as bad as the Papists; this being so directly contrary*, saith Heylin *to the Iudgment and opinion of this Dr. Abbot who was then Vice-Chancellor, Laud was exposed by him (on the next occasion) to publick shame and Censure:* as *Howson* and *Corbet* both of *Christ's Church* had been before by the same Dr. *Abbot* in the like case; *the first having been suspended propter conciones minus Orthodoxas, for accusing the Geneua notes on the Bible of mis-interpretation concerning Christ's Divinity and Messiah-ship. The Other soundly ratled by the Repetitioner, for grating vpon Calvin's manifest perverting the sense and meaning of the Article of*

p. 62.

Christ's descending into Hell. These are *Historicall Passages*, which discouer this Dr. *Abbot* not only to haue acted in fauour of *Geneua*, out of *complyance* with his *Brother*, but out of *Opinion* and *Judgment*. So doe the *Praises* he giues Mr. *Perkins as a man well deseruing for his great trauail and pains for the furtherance of true Religion, and edifying of the Church*; as his Aduersary Dr. *Bishop* cites the words in his *Reproof* pag. 48. and the same is confirmed by his last *Swan-like-song*, as the *English-Dutch-British* Author of *Herwologia Anglica* calls it *Cygnea cantio de gratia & perseverantia Sanctorum*, of the *Grace* and *Perseverance* of the *Saints*. And Dr. St. knows *who they be, that hold no falling from Grace*. By all which it appears, that Dr. St. himself was *grossly mistaken* in point of *History*, when he affirmed of Robert Abbot Bp. of Salisbury that *he was neuer till now suspected for a Puritan*, he being Brother to Arch Bp *Abbot* as wel in *Judgment* as *Nature*, with that difference only which the *Poet* obserues to be vsually found in the faces of such *neer Relations*, *Facies non vna duobus*

nec diversa tamen. And I thinke T. G. may with more reason *return* Dr. St's words vpon him, that *he has a faculty of doing greater wonders with seuen or eight words* viz (*Robert Abbot was neuer till now suspected for a Puritan*) than changing a *Bishop* into an *Arch Bp* And that he may *hope* too, *the Dr understands the Church he opposes, better than that he vndertakes to defend, otherwise wee are like to haue a sad account of history from him*: for to me it seems a *greater wonder* to change a *Prelatik* into a Puritan than a *Bishop*, into an *Arch Bp.* And likely to bring greater *confusion* into *History*, to *erre* in the *Quality* of the *Person*, than to *mistake* him for his *Brother* they being as *Like* as *Twins* to each other. Had I any power with Dr. St. I would aduise him not to be so *Tragical* vpon such *sleight* occasions, The Reader may think either that some secret *Splinters* of the *Lance stick* in the *Dragons Iawes*, which he cannot free himself from; or that he could find nothing of *moment* in his Adversary to exercise his *Talent* vpon; when he sees him *fling* and *lay* about him so *vnreasonably* for a *thing* of

nothing, and in which his own *mistake* was farr the greater, the *quality* or *Judgment* of the *Person* being more to the purpose than his *Individuality*.

Cathar: Euery one you know hath his seuerall *Gift*, and will exercise it as he sees *best* for his *cause*. I shall trouble you but with *one Instance* more vpon this subiect at present, and that is the Answer which T. G. giues to the other *six Authors*, whom he reckons of the same kind, with those of whom, Dr. St. saith, *for meer shame he will not say they were Puritans, or Puritanically inclined*, Viz, *that they charged the Papists with what they thought they did, but the Papists deny they doe any such thing*. A *Pretty* Answer truely, and which seems to me to be the *Same*, as Dr. St. well obserues, as to say *They charge them with Idolatry, but the Papists deny they commit it. And so saith he they doe when I charge them with it: So that T. G. by the very same reason might haue acquitted me from charging them with it, and haue spared his Book*.

Eun: What needed the words *for meer shame*, when T. G. did not *charge* the

aforesaid *six* Authors of being *Puritans or Puritanically inclin'd?* But the *Gift* must be kept in *vre* for fear of growing *restiff*. What T. G. answers (howeuer Dr. St. moulds it after his own fashion to make it appear *ridiculous*) is this, that *whoeuer attentiuely considers but the very places cited by Dr. St. out of those* Authors, *shall find that they do not impugn the doctrine it self of the Church of Rome, or the practice conformable to that doctrine; but such things as they conceiued to be great Abuses in the practice of it,* which by the way is all can be made out of the Drs *new Testimony* of Arch Bp. *Bancroft* when he charges the *Papists, with I know not what* (they are his own words) *intolerable superstition and Idolatry*, And in this T. G. sayes, *these* Authors *differ only as more or less in the same kind, from what Mr Thorndike, and other learned Protestants pretend, when they reproue some practices, as Idolatrous, or at least in danger to be such*, when neuertheless as Dr. St. Himself acknowledges in his *first Preface*, they *excuse the Church of Rome from Idolatry, although not all who liue*

in Communion of it. Now to me, I confeſſ it ſeems not to be the *ſame*, to *accuſe the Doctrine of a Church and the Practice conformable to that doctrine*, which is what *Dr. St.* doth in *charging* the *Church of Rome as guilty of Idolatry*; and to *reproue ſome abuſes conceiued to be committed in the practice of it*, which is what the aforeſaid *Authors* doe. Again, it ſeems not to me to be the *ſame*, *not to excuſe all the perſons who liue in the Communion of a Church from the guilt of Idolatry*, which is what Mr. *Thorndike*, and thoſe other *Learned Proteſtants* doe; and to *accuſe the Church of Rome*, *for requiring by the termes of Communion with her*, *the committing Idolatry*, *paralel to that of the Heathens*, as Dr. St. does. Theſe I take to be very *different charges*, and ſo did Dr. St. vnderſtand them, when he ſaid, that *vpon the whole matter T. G. cannot produce any one Perſon of our Church that hath clearly and wholly* (mark that) *acquitted the Church of Rome from the charge of Idolatry.* It was not then T. G's. *denying* (as Dr. St. repreſents it) *that thoſe of the Church of Rome de*

commit Idolatry in the practices those Authors reproue, that *acquits* them, (*though not in the whole, yet in part*) *of the charge of Idolatry*, as it is aduanced by Dr. St. but their own *excusing*, (as himself confesses) *the Church of Rome from Idolatry, though not all who liue in the Cõmunion of it.* From whence it followes that the *case* is not the *same* between *them* and *Dr. St.* who asserts, that *all the Members of that Church must by the terms of Communion with her be guilty of damnable hypocrisy or Idolatry.* i. e. if their *practice* be *conformable* to her *doctrine*, since the *termes* of *Communion* can oblige them to no more And now if *this* be what he means by the *Sense* of the *Church* of *England* when *he would not be thought to contradict* it, I thinke he will neuer be able to make out that *it is so*; when that *Church* proposes no such thing in her *Articles*, and such *Eminent Diuines* of her *Communion*, as are fartheſt from the *suspition* of *Puritanism* affirm the *contrary.* For what the *Church* of *Rome* requires of *those* of her *Communion* in the Point of *Ima-*

gest (the grand *contest* at present between Dr. St. and his *Adversary*) as it is declared in the 2d. *Council* of *Nice* (to which the *Council* of *Trent* refers, and to which, according to the Drs. *own Rule we are to appeal for the Sense of that Church and not to the testimonies of particular persons*) what I say the *Church* of *Rome requires* there of *those* of her *Communion*, is to *salute and giue an honorary adoration* (or *respect* as the term *Adoration* is there declared to mean) *to the Images of Christ and his Saints, like as is giuen to the Figure of the Holy Crosse, to Chalices, to the Books of the Holy Gospels, and such like sacred vtensils: but not Latria which (as true Faith teacheth) is due only to God.* And in this, as T. G. shewed (and it ought to be *repeated* because Dr. St. takes no *notice* of it in his *Defence*) the *Council* is vindicated from *Idolatry* by *Eminent diuines*, as I said, of the *Church* of *England*, as Mr. *Thorndike*, who freely confesses, that *he must maintain as vnquestionable, that the Council of Nice enioyns no Idolatry*, and Dr. *Feild*, who affirms

Cath. no Idol. p. 144.

Epil. 3. P. p. 363.

Of the Church li. 3. c. 36.

that *the Nicen Fathers mean nothing elsly adorati n f Images, but embracing, kissing and reverently vsing of them, like to the Honour, we* (saith he) *do the Books of Holy Scripture*: and Bp. *Montague* hauing laid down the *doctrine* of the *Church* of *Rome* in these termes, *you say the Pictures of Christ, the Bd. Virgin and Saints must not haue Latria; so Wee. You giue them Dulia: I quarrel not the term*, saith he, *though I could. There is a respect due vnto, and honour giuen relatiuely to them. If this you call Dulia, we giue it too. Let practice and Doctrine go together, we agree.* So that it is not the *doctrine* of the *Church* of *Rome* (if *truely* stated out of the *Decrees* of her *Councils*) or *practice agreable* to that *doctrine*, which these *Divines* impeach as *Idolatrous*; but the *Opinions* of some *School-Diuines*, or *Abuses they conceiu'd to be committed in the practice of it*. And I think T. G. hath still good reason to *desire the Reader to iudge, whether Dr. St. being* (as he saith) *by command publickely engaged in the defence of so Ex-*

Gagg. p. 318.

cellent a cause, as that of the Church of England against the Church of Rome, haue not betrayd his Trust, and his Church too (if it be his) by aduancing such a Medium to iustify her separation, as contradicts the sense of that Church, if it be to be taken form the Sentiments of those who are esteem'd her true and Genuine sons: that is (as Dr. St. paraphrases) *the most remote from all suspition of disaffection to her, or Inclination to Puritanism* (as these were) and in the *Iudgment* of Mr. *Thorndike, makes her in plain termes to be Schismaticall. This* T. G. Saith, *will appear yet more clearly, if we consider how this charge of Idolatry, as maintained by Dr. St. subuerts the very foundation of Ecclesiasticall Authority in the Church of England,* of which I may haue occasion to speak hereafter.

What I *obserue* at present is, that how *couragiously* soeuer He *charges* the *Church* of *Rome* with *Idolatry*, yet he *Seldome* or but *Obiter* only speaks of the *Images* of *Christ* and his *Saints*, which are the *only subiect* of the *Decree* of the *Council* of *Trent*, and conse-

quently ought to be the *chief* if not *only argument* of his *Book*; but the main of his discourse is of the *Image* of *God*, which *Bellarmin* tells vs *belongs not to Faith, but stands vnder Opinion*: and thereupon taxes *Calvin of extraordinary fraud and craft, who after he had proued, that Images of God are not to be made, as being incongruous to the diuine nature, runs out into Amplifications* (in which he is *followed* and at last *out-run* by Dr. St.) *and sings Io triumphe in so merry a tone, as if he had proued it vnlawfull to make or worship any Image at all.* And vpon this acount, I confesse I thinke T. G. might haue *spared* his *Book*, till the Dr. had thought fit to speak to this *Essentiall Question, Whether it be Idolatry for a Christian to giue, not Latria, which is due only to God, but a honourary respect and Veneration, to the Images of Christ and his Saints; such as is giuen to the Books of the Holy Gospells, to the Sacraments, and such like sacred Things?* This being as much as the *Church* of *Rome* requires by the *terms* of *Communion* with her. If Dr. St. can *proue this* to be *Idolatry*, the

To. 1. li. 2. c. 1.

Knight muſt *vnbuckle his Armour, deſcend from his ſteed, and yeild vp his Lance.* But if *Declining* this, he will ſet himſelf to *combate* the *Opinions* of *ſchool men* concerning the nature of the *worship*, ſome of them contending that the *worship*, due to *Holy Images* in general is Religious, and to *that* of *Chriſt* Latria, &c. Howeuer it may ſerue him to *his* purpoſe (which himſelf knows beſt *what it is*, and others are not *wholly* ignorant of,) it will be *nothing* to the *Queſtion*; ſince none of *thoſe expreſſions* are found in their *Profeſſion* of *Faith*, or the *Decrees* of their *Councils, from whence we are to take the terms of Communion with that Church.* And as Mr. *Thorndike* well obſerueth. (*Iuſt weights.* ch. 1.) *we are not to forſake it for the actions of particular perſons contrary to that which they publickly profeſſ.* For my part as I told you I am of the ſame Mr. *Thorndike's* mind, when he ſaith, that *for any to charge the Pope to be Antichriſt, and the Papiſts Idolaters, is to lead the People by the Noſe, to beliene that they can proue their Suppoſition, when they cannot*; but much

more as it is *managed* by Dr. Sr. for which I shall give you my *reasons* to morrow, if you can be at leisure.

Cathar. I shall preferr no *business* to *this*, and therefore pray fail not to be as *good* as your word.

Eun. Til then Farewel.

THE SECOND DIALOGVE.

THE ARGUMENT.

A Farther Declaration of the Senſe of the Church of England concerning the Charge of Idolatry, in anſwer to what Dr. St. urges from the Teſtimony of Arch Biſhop Whitgift, and the 39. Articles. The Lambeth Articles ſuppreſſed by Q. Eliz. And rejected by K. James: The Dr. deſired to reconcile the doctrine of his Irenicum, viz, that nothing is lawfull in the worſhip of God but what he hath expreſsly commanded; with that in his Anſwer to N. O. that All things are lawfull which are not forbidden. The true meaning of the 22th. Article concerning the worſhipping and Adoration of Images aſſerted.

CATHARINVS EVNOMIVS.

Cathar. What you diſcourſed yeſterday concerning the *ſenſe* of

the *Church* of *England*, hath I confeſſ confirmed me ſomething more in the *Judgment*, our *Party* hath alwaies made of *that Church*, that it is but too much inclind to *Rome*. And if euer they lay aſide the *Diſputes* about the *Nature* of the *Worship* which you look vpon as *Impertinent*, and come vp cloſely to *debate* what you call the *Eſſentiall* Queſtion, *Whether a Chriſtian may not giue a honourary reſpect and Veneration to the Images of Chriſt and his Saints?* I think they will quickly come to an *agreement*, and ſo fare-well the *Reformation*: and much more if the *Charge* it ſelf of *Idolatry*, which you will haue to be *hartily* and *throughly* aduanced by none but the *Puritan* Party may not be made vſe of to *Juſtify the ſeparation*. I am very deſirous to hear what you can ſay vpon this *Subiect*; but *two things* haue occurred to me ſince yeſterday, vpon a *Review* I made of Dr. St's. *Generall Preface* about the former contention between *him* and T. G. concerning the *Senſe* of the *Church* of *England*: and I ſhould be glad, you would firſt ſpeak to them.

Eun. I cannot eaſily believe, that any thing

thing *Material* in that matter hath *escaped* your *diligence*. But if you think *them* so, I pray propose them.

Cathar. The *first*, being about a *particular* Author Arch Bp. *Whitgift*, Is not *So Materiall*, as the *Second*, which I take to be an Euident *Demonstration* from the publickly authorized *Articles* of the *Church* of *England*, that the *Charge* of *Idolatry*, as aduanced by Dr. St. against the *Church* of *Rome*, is the *Dogmaticall Sense* of *that* Church.

Eun. I wonder *so important* a passage should haue been forgotten, and which *alone* would haue *done* the work. But first, what of Arch Bp. *Whitgift*?

Cathar. Why must He, Saith Dr. St. *be thrown away to the Puritans?* (I could *quarrel* the expression, but that I suppose him to speak his *Aduersary's* mind, not his *own*) *why must He be thrown away* (*saith he*) *to the Puritans, when all the world knows he was a great Aduersary to T. C. on the very account of the Puritan cause?* But *he is known also*, saith T. G. *to haue consented to the framing of the Lambeth Articles, and sending them to the Diuines of Cambridge.* And what then? *Are the Dominicans*

Puritans, and no Papists? If the Church of Rome may haue liberty not to determin those nice Points, why may not the Church of England? And so both parties remain of it, as long as they contradict no receiued Articles among vs? But then again *the Lambeth Articles were neuer intended for any more, then as Responsa Prudentum to silence disputes in the Vniversity. And I beleeue none of the Puritan Party after that took Arch Bp. Whitgift to be a Patron of the Cause.*

Enn. Admitting all this to be as you say, yet I see not but Arch Bp *Whitgift* by this *fact* of his, brought himself at least vnder the *Suspition* of being *Puritanically inclin'd*, which was *all* that T. G. aimed at to show, in opposition to what Dr. St. himself had asserted, *that of all persons of that Age none could be less suspected to be Puritanically inclined than Arch Bp. Whitgift.* Now that there was *ground* at least of *Suspition* of it in this *fact*, (howeuer he defended the *Church* of *England* against T. C.) appears first because *Whitaker* and *Perkins*, *both Caluinists*, saith Dr. Heylin *and both of them Supralap-*

Cyprian. Angl. pag. 193.

farians, were the chief *Promoters* and *sollicitors* for the *making* those *Articles*, among which the 5th carries that very *stamp* vpon it which Dr. St. giues for a *mark* of *Puritanism*, that *there is no falling from Grace*. 2*dly* because the *Arch Bp.* himself *consented* to the *framing* of those *Articles*, and *proposed* them to the *Divines* of *Cambridge for regulating disputations in those Points of Controuersy*. And though they were not intended as *Articles determin'd* by the *Church* but as *Responsa Prudentum* (not so much to *silence*, as to *regulate* disputes) yet the Arch Bp. it seems thought it *prudent* by this proceeding to *countenance* the *maintaining* of *them*. 3*dly* because the *news* of these *proceedings* being brought to the *Queen*, she was so *offended*, that *once she was at a point to haue them all endited of a Præmunire, had not the high esteem she had for Whitgift, whom she commonly called her Black Husband, repriened all the rest from the danger of it*. And her *Offence* proceeded not only from their *intrenchment* vpon her *Prerogatiue* in making such a declaration without her *Authority*; but from the *Information*

Ibid. p. 132. she had *how litle those Articles agreed with the Practice of Piety and Obedience to all Gouernment*: whereupon *such a strict cours was taken for the suppressing of them, that a Copy of them was not to be found in Cambridge for a long time after, though after the Queen's death they began to peep abroad again.*

4*thly* Because *K. James was no better conceited of them, than Q. Elizabeth was; for when it was moued by Dr. Reynolds, at Hamptoncourt that the nine Orthodoxall Assertions (as He pleased to call them) which were concluded on at Lambeth, might be admitted into the Confession of the Church of England, the King so much disliked the motion, that it was presently reiected without more adoe.* This is the account which Dr. Heylin giues of this matter in his Cyprianus Angl. p. 193. 194. And I desire any indifferent Person to consider whether the *Arch Bp's consenting* to the *framing* these Articles, and *sending* them to *Cambridge*, and thereby *countenancing* the *maintaining* of them, were not *sufficient* to bring him at least vnder the *Suspition* of being *Puritanically inclined*, and consequently *ground* enough

for T. G. to lay this *Exception* against *him.* What esteem the *Puritan* Party had for him after it I know not. If they did not look vpon him as a *Patron*, they had reason I am sure to think him a *Favourer.* For my part I should not stick to hold that *Dominican* to be *no true Papist*, but a *Patron* of the *cause.* who should doe but the *half* of what Arch Bp. *Whitgift* did.

Cathar: This *Peter Heylin's* Book I see, serues you for a *store house* to furnish you with *Historicall* passages, as Dr St. saith, that *Bellarmin and Coccius do T. G, for Testimonies of the* Fathers. But he is known to be a *great Enemy* to the *Puritan Party.*

Eun. And that makes it the more vnlikely, that he would, though not *throw away* so *eminent* a Man to the *Puritans*, yet bring him at leust by such a relation vnder the *Suspition* of being a *Fauourer* of *them.* But what is it after all, that Arch Bp. Whitgift says?

Cathar. Marry, that *there are three kinds of Idolatry The one is, when the true God is worshipped by other means and wayes, than he hath prescribed, or would be worshipped. The other is when*

the true God is worshiped with fals Gods: the third is when we worship fals Gods, and altogether forget the worship of the true God. And although, he saith *he cannot see or learn, that the Papists are in this third kind of Idolatry yet he condemns them as guilty of the two former*: which is *enough* and too much for any *Christians*.

Euno. I haue not Arch Bp. *Whitgift's* Book by me to see on what *occasion* he said this, nor what *connexion* these words haue to the *Antecedent* and *consequent* discourse, but as they stand, they seem to me but to involue him *deeper* in the *suspition* of *Puritanism*. But first I pray tell me, what you vnderstand by his *first kind* of *Idolatry*: when (as he saith) *the true God is worshipped by other means and ways, than he hath prescribed or would be worshipped.*

Cathar. I know Dr. St. saith *his meaning* is, *when God is worshipped against his expresse Command*: but the words to me seem not so much to *condemn* of *Idolatry* the giuing that *worship* to *God*, which he hath *expresly forbidden*; as the giving him *any* worship, which he hath not *expresly com-*

manded. And this appears euident to me from the *Application* the Arch Bp. makes, of what he had ſaid, to the *Papiſts*, viz, *that they worhip God other wiſe than his will is, and otherwiſe than he hath preſcribed* i. e. by *means* and *wayes*, which he hath *not commanded*; and then, that *they alſo giue to the creature that which is due to the Creator, and ſin againſt the firſt Table.* i. e. againſt his *expreſſ* Prohibition in the 2d *Commandment*.

Eun. This I should also take with Dr. St's. leaue to be the *meaning* of his words. And now I beſeech you to conſider if this do not involue him more *deeply* yet in the *ſuſpition* of *Puritaniſm*. For although I do not make *the charging the Papiſts to be Idolaters* to be a *diſtinctive ſigne* of *Puritaniſm*, yet Dr. St. himſelf in his anſwer to N. O. p. 181. doth; when he ſaith that *thoſe who ſeparate from the Church of England make this their Fundamentall Principle as to worship, (wherein the difference lyes) that nothing is lawfull in the worship of God, but what he hath expreſsly commanded: We ſay all things are lawful which are not forbidden: and vpon this*

single Point saith he the *whole Controversy of separation stands as to the Constitutiõ of our Church.* Now if this single Point be, as Dr. St. saith, the *Criterium* between a *Protestant* and a *Puritan*, that the *former* says *all things are lawfull* in the worship of God which are *not forbidden*, and the *latter*, that *nothing is lawfull* but what he hath *expressly commanded*; And Arch Bp. *Whitgift* haue carried his *charge* so *farr*, as to make it *Idolatry*, not only to *worship* God *against his expresse command* but by *other means and ways than he hath commanded*, it is plain that according to Dr. St. himself, he takes part with the Puritans in that very *Point*, vpon which the *whole Controversy of the Separation stands as to them.*

Cathar. This is one of those which they call *Argumenta ad hominem.* And I cannot but *wonder* Dr. St. would lay himself *open* to it by *varying* so much from his *Old Principles* so firmly setled by him in his *Irenicum*, where page 6. he teacheth, that *in those things which are therefore only Good because commanded, a command is necessary to make them*

them lawfull, as in immediate poſitiue Acts of worſhip towards God; in which nothing is lawfull any further, than it is founded vpon a Diuine Command. I Speak not, ſaith he, *of Circumſtances belonging to the acts of Worſhip, but whatsoeuer is looked vpon, as a part of Diuine Worſhip, if it be not commanded by God himſelf, it is no ways acceptable to him, and therefore not lawfull.* And then a litle after. *Although euen here we may ſay too, that it is not meerly the want of a Diuine Precept, which makes any part of Diuine Worſhip vncommanded by God vnlawfull, but the General Prohibition, that nothing ſhould be done in the immediate Worſhip of God, but what we haue a Diuine Command for.*

Eun. This is a *Wonder* indeed; and muſt be attributed to *theſe men*, who as Dr. St. ſaith, *haue a faculty of doing greater wonders with five words, than changing a Biſhop into an Arch. Biſhop*: for if they are not the *cauſe*, they haue been at leaſt the *occaſion* of this *great change* in *him*, viz that whereas before he *aſſerted* with thoſe of *your* Party, that *nothing is lawfull in the immediate*

worship of God, but what is commanded: he *affirms* now with the *Church* of *England*, that *all things are lawfull which are not forbidden*; vnleſſ we may impute it to a *greater light* of the *Spirit*, which I am ſure *you* will not. For other conſiderations which your friend *Patronus bonæ fidei* would haue thought to be the Motiues of this Change, I ſhall not concern my ſelf with them.

Prodr. p. 76.

Cathar. Whateuer wrought the *wonder* in Dr. St. or howeuer Arch-Biſhop *Whitgift* fell upon this *Principle*, that *to worship the true God by other means and ways, than He had preſcribed, is Idolatry*; his name is not found that I know of, among *our Worthies*; and you cannot deny, but that he *charges* the *Papiſts* with *this* kind of *Idolatry*, and that *other* too of *giuing to the Creature that which is due to the Creator.*

Eun. Whether it were *heat* of *diſputation*, or *condeſcendence* to free himſelf from a *troubleſome* Adverſary, who had taxed him for *hauing ſpoke ſomething in behalf of the Papiſts* (of which there is ſome *appearance* in his words cited by the Dr.) yet *his charge* as you

Pref. to Rem. I do lat.

ſee, *ſo farr forth* as it makes the giuing to God *any worship* which he hath *not commanded*, to be *Idolatry*, is grounded vpon the very *Fundamental Principle*, which according to Dr. St. diſtinguishes the *Puritan* Party, from *thoſe* of the *Church* of *England*; and ſo can be *no Proof* that it is the *Senſe* of *that Church*. And for the 2d part of it, viz that the *Papiſts giue to the Creature that which is due to the Creator*, we may conſider the *time* when he liued, in the beginning of *Q. Elizabeth*, of *which* you haue heard what Dr. *Heylin* ſaith. However, methinks Dr. St. ought not to aſſert this *Charge* of *Idolatry* to be the *Senſe* of the *Church* of *England*, but might haue been *content* to haue it paſſ for one of thoſe *nice Points*, of which, himſelf ſaith, that the *Church may haue liberty not to determin*, when the *Church* herſelf (as I ſaid before) in her 39. *Articles* reiects the *Romish doctrine concerning worshipping and Adoration of Images*, *not* as *Idolatry*, but *as a fond thing vainly inuented, and grounded vpon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God*. And therefore that he

exceeded the bounds, which he ought to haue *obſerued* as the *Champion* of the *Church* of *England*, in making it to be her *Senſe* to *charge that* with *Idolatry*, which the *Compilers* of the *Articles* call only a *fond thing vainly invented*; and in *poſitively defining that* to be *expreſsly* prohibited in the 2d *Commandment*, which *they*, after their beſt inquiry, pronounce *Problematically* only as *rather repugnant to the word of God, than agreable to it.*

Cath. *This* is the *very place*, which Dr. St. hath pitch'd vpon to proue his *charge* of *Idolatry* to be the *Senſe* of the *Church* of *England*. And he hath done it ſo *home*, that I think there is no *avoiding* it. And that you may better ſee the *force* of his Arguments, I shall put them in *form*. And Firſt he argues alſo *ad hominem* againſt T. G. in this manner.

If T. G. and *all others* of their *Diuines* yeild *that adoration of Inages* which the *Church* of *England* charges them with, to be *Idolatry*, then they muſt needs grant it to be *her ſenſe* to charge them with *Idolatry*.

But *T. G. and all others of their*

Divines, yeild that Adoration of Images, which our Church chargeth them with Art. 22. (viz, *not barely worshipping, but Adoration of Images*) *to be Idolatry.* Therefore they muſt grant it to be *her ſenſe* to *charge* them with *Idolatry.*

And that it is *not meerly the Practice uſed in the Church of Rome but their very doctrine, which the Church of England chargeth with Idolatry* heproues no leſſe ſtrongly by this 2d *Argument.*

The Romiſh doctrine (mark that) *concerning the worshipping and Adoration of Images &c. is a fond thing, vainly inuented, and grounded upon no warranty of ſcripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God.* *Art.* 22.

Therefore it is *not meerly the Practice uſed in the Church of Rome but their very doctrine concerning Adoration of Images, which is here charged.*

But a Church cannot teach Adoration of Images but she muſt be guilty of Idolatry;

Ergo the *Senſe* of the *Article* is to *charge* with *Idolatry* the very *doctrine* of the *Church* of *Rome* concerning the *Adoration of Images.* What doe you think of this my Friend?

Eun. I'le be sworn, I think Dr. St. is much obliged to you for *reducing* his Arguméts into *form*: for as you haue done it, they appear at first sight *Formidable* indeed, like an *vpper* and *lower Range* of *Teeth* with their *Maiors*, *Minors*, *Subsumptions*, and *Conclusions*, threatning the very last *extremity* of *danger* to the *Knight*, if he dare euermore *direct his lance into the Dragon's mouth*. But then vpon *second* considerations, I think he may venture to draw neer, for (if I mistake not) *these arguments*, like the *Young men*, who arose to *play* before *Abner* and *Ioab*, *catch each other by the head*, *and thrust their swords into their fellows side*; and both *fall down together*. And I doubt not to make you see it as clearly, as *two* and *three* make *five*, if we can but agree what is meant by those words of the Article viz *The Romish Doctrine concerning Adoration of Images*: For the term *Romish Doctrine* is not clear, and as Mr. *Thorndike* hath obserued, the word *Adoratiõ is and may be in despite of our hearts Equiuocall*, i. e. sometimes signifie *one kind* of honour, and sometimes *another*.

Cathar. But I haue a way to *auoid* all

that in the preſent caſe, by telling you, that, *the Romish doctrine concerning Adoration of Images*, is as if one should ſay, *the Adoration of Images taught in the Church of Rome.*

Eun. Very *Identically* anſwered I can aſſure you; and as much as is *needfull.* Let vs then *apply* it to our preſent *purpose*, and reduce *both* arguments into *one*, ſince the *Firſt* is but a *conſequence* of the *Second.*

It is not meerly the Practice vſed in the Church of Rome, but their very doctrine concerning Adoration of Images, i. e. the Adoration of Images taught in that Church, *which is Charged by the Church of England.*

But T. G. and all others of their Divines yeild that Adoration of Images which our Church chargeth them with, i. e. which is taught in the Church of Rome, *to be Idolatry.* Ergo.

Doe you not ſee how if the *Firſt* Propoſition be *true*, the ſecond is *falſe?* For who euer heard that T. G. or any other of the *Divines* of the *Church* of *Rome*, held the *doctrine* taught in that *Church*, concerning the *Adoration of Images* to be *Idolatry*? And conſequent.

ly to vſe a *ſimile* ſuitable to the Dr's *Genius*, the *Teeth* of *this dragon* like *thoſe* of that *other* ſown by *Cadmus*, come vp like armed *Souldiers*, but *fight* and *Deſtroy* each other. For if T. G. and all others of their *Diuines* do *not yeild the Adoration of Images taught in the Church of Rome to be Idolatry* (as certainly they doe not) tis manifeſt that they do not yeild *that Adoration of Images* to be *Idolatry*, which the *Church* of *England* chargeth them with; if she *charge* the *very doctrine* of *that* Church.

Cathar. I did not think ſuch *vſe* could be made of *Identicall* Propoſitions, as you haue made of them. But what do you ſay to *each* argument a part.

Eun. I ſay that by the words, *Romiſh doctrine concerning Adoration of Images, may be vnderſtood*, either the *doctrine* taught in her *Schools*. which being but the *Opinions* of Particular Perſons, no man is *bound* to follow: or the *Doctrine* taught in her *Councils*, to which *all* thoſe of her *Communion* are bound to *ſubmit* by the terms of *Communion* with her. And if the *Doctrine* which the *Church* of *England* here

chargeth, be *that* which is *taught* in the *Church* of *Rome* by ſome of her *School-Diuines* (which I take indeed to be her *true* meaning) this alſo is denyed (at leaſt by thoſe very *Diuines* who *teach* it ,) to be *Idolatry* : and comes not *home* to the *charge* aduanced by Dr. St. viz that *what she requires by the termes of her Communion is Idolatry*. And ſo the firſt argument falls to the ground. But if you will haue the *Church* of *England* to lay her *charge* againſt the *Doctrine* of the *Church* of *Rom* in her *Councils* concerning *worshipping and Adoration of Images*; herein *She* is *vindicated* from the note of *Idolatry* by *Eminent Diuines*, and *ſuch* as haue alwaies been eſteemed the *true* and *Genuine* Sons of the *Church* of *England*, as you heard before. And ſo the *ſecond* goes after the *firſt*. For were this her *Senſe* , thoſe Diuines had not eſcaped without ſome *note* , if not incurred the *cenſure* of *excommunication* for maintaining the *contrary*. In a word , which way ſoeuer you vnderſtand the words, *Romish Doctrine concerning Adoration of Images*, all that the *Church* of *England* chargeth it with , is that it is *a*

fond thing, vainly inuented and rather repugnant to the word of God, but *not* that is *Idolatry*.

Cathar. But as Dr. St. wel obſerues, *It is not barely worshipping*, but *Adoration of Images which is here charged: And can any Church teach Adoration of Images, and not be guilty of Idolatry? Or were the Compilers of the Articles ſo Senſeleſſe, as not to think Idolatry repugnant to Scripture?*

Eun. I hope I may ſuppoſe the *Church* of *England*, to be as *little in loue with wrangling about words*, as Dr. St. *profeſſes* himſelf to be: You haue heard Mr. *Thorndike* and others affirm, that the word *Adoration is or may be in deſpite of our hearts Equiuocall*, that is ſometimes ſignify *one* kind of honour, ſometimes *another*, And if it be taken, not for *Latria*, which is due to God, but to ſignify an *Honourary reſpect* and *Veneration* (as *they confeſſ* it is vſed in the 2d *Council* of *Nice*) they maintain it is not *Idolatry*: which they could not haue done without a Reproof were it the *Senſe* of the *Church* of *England*, that it is *Idolatry*. As for the *Compilers of the Articles*, I do not take

them to be ſo *Senſeleſſ*, as not to think *Idolatry repugnant to Scripture*, but had they *thought* it to be *Idolatry*, thay had been *Senseleſſ* indeed to reiect it only *as being rather repugnant to the word of God.*

Cathar. An *ingenious Criticiſm* indeed! as Dr. St. calls it: but ſuch an one as *had been vtterly loſt, if T. G. had looked into the Latin Articles, where the words are,* Immo verbo Dei contradicit, *whereby it appears, that* [*rather*] *is not vſed as a term of diminution, but of a more vehement affirmation.*

Eun. And what of this *for the loue of Grammar*? Would the Dr. haue the word *rather* to be of ſo *vehement an affirmation*, as to affect the words that *follow*, and affirm it to be abſolutely *repugnant to the word of God?* This were to make the *Compilers* no wiser *Grammarians*, than He would haue them thought to be *Diuines*, and to ſend the *Church of England* to School to learn her *Accidence.* Or would he haue it only to be a more vehement *Affirmation* of what went before, that is, that they looked upon the *worshipping of*

Images, not only as *grounded upon no warranty of ſcripture*, but of the two *to be rather repugnant*, than agreable *to the word of God*? This is what was urgedby T. G. againſt him to shew his *Confidence* in peremptorily fixing vpon the *Church* of *England* a ſenſe which she durſt not own. Haue but a litle patience and I shall giue yon the very words of T. G. which had the Dr. ſet down, this notable Criticiſm of his had been vtterly loſt.

Cath. no Idol. p. 197.

As for any Command, ſaith he, of " God forbiding to honour the Images " of Chriſt and his Saints, beſides that " I haue shown that Aſſertion to be in " every reſpect groundleſs, yet for the " ſatisfaction of the true Proteſtant Rea- " der I shall adde one Obſervation more " upon that ſubject. And it is this, that " the Compilers of the 39. Articles (in " which is contained the doctrine of the " Church of England) ſufficiently infi- " nuate they could find no ſuch cõmand, " when they rejected the Adoration of " Images, not as Idolatry (as the Dr. " doth) but only as a Fond thing, vainly " invented; nor as repugnant to the plain "

words of Scripture (as they profeſſ very roundly Artic. 28. though without ground, when they ſpeak of Tranſubſtantiation) but as being *rather* repugnant to the word of God: Which Qualification of theirs plainly giues us to underſtand. That they had done their endeavours to find a Command, but could meet with none ; For had they made any ſuch diſcovery either in the Second Commandment, or els where in the Word of God , they would not haues pared to tell us of it , and haue cry'd it down for flat Idolatry , as the Dr. does. In the mean time, ſaith he, it is pleaſant (I should have ſaid *Sad*) to ſee what Veneration this Champion of the Church of England, hath either for the compilers of thoſe Articles, or for the Articles themſelues , when what they call only a Fond thing , a vain Invention ; he condemns as Idolatry, moſt damnable Idolatry ; and Magiſterially declares it to be expreſsly prohibited in the ſecond Commandment, when they after the beſt Inquiry they could make , pronounce only Problematically, that in their Iudgment, they

thought it to be rather repugnant, than
" conformable to the word of God. Thus
" cleerly hath T. G. evinced the ſenſe of the Church of England in this matter. And although he had not only that *regard* to her as to repel the odious *charge* of *Idolatry* (which Dr. St. would have *fixed* vpon her) by shewing he had *not proved* what he *vndertook*; but that *Civility* alſo for the Dr. himſelf, as not to charge him with downright *contradicting the ſenſe of that Church* which he was engaged to *defend*, I think it my part to ſpeak my mind more *freely*, and affirm as I may do from what I have here alledged, that t'is plain he *diſſents from the ſenſe of the Church of England:* while he endeauours to make *that worshipping and Adoration of Images* which the *Church* of *Rome* teacheth in her *Councils*, and requires *ſubmiſſion* to by the terms of *Communion* with her, to be *Idolatry*. I shall proceed, if you give leaue, in our next Conference to lay downe the *dangerous* and *deteſtable conſequences*, vrged by T. G. as following from the charge of Idolatry and particularly that of the *Subverſion*

of all Eccleſiaſticall Authority in the Church of England; to all which Dr. St. hath either returned *nothing* at all, or ſuch an anſwer as is worth *iuſt nothing*.

Cathar. This with your leaue, is I hope, *more* than you can make *good*: and therefore I pray *thinke well on't* againſt the next time we meet.

THE THIRD DIALOGVE.

THE ARGUMENT.

SEverall important Conſequences urged by T. G. as following from the charge of Idolatry, which the Dr. paſſes by in ſilence. His obligation either to deny, or aſſign a diſtinct Church in all Ages, preſerved from Hereſy and Idolatry, with which Chriſtians were bound to ioyn in Communion. T. G's Arguments to ſhew the Roman Church to be that Church, not anſwered by the Dr. nor the Queſtion propoſed by T. G. concerning the neceſſity of ioining with the Church of England. His Irenicall Doctrine; Of the lawfulneſſ of Non-Communion with any Church, that impoſeth doubtfull or ſuſpected Practices. The charge of Idolatry not maintainable upon the Dr's Principles without groſſ ſelf-contradiction.

CATHAR

CATHARINVS, EVNOMIVS.

Cathar. You promiſed at our laſt parting to let me ſee I know not what *dangerous* and *deteſtable conſequences*, which T. G. vrged as following from the *charge of Idolatry*, and to which you ſay Dr. St. hath either returned *nothing* at all in anſwer, or ſuch an anſwer as is worth *iuſt nothing*. And I cannot but *wonder* they ſhould be of any importance, when Dr. St. at the end of his *defence* ſaith, *he hath gone through all the material points in T. G's Booke, which relate to the General nature of Idolatry; and diligently weighed and conſidered euery thing that looked like a difficulty in the Controuerſy about the worſhip of Images.* p. 877.

Eun. How Dr. St. hath performed this, his Readers will iudge. But there are other *material Difficulties* relating to the *Charge* of *Idolatry* (be it's *nature* what it will, of which we may ſpeak here after) which he hath either *not weighed* or *conſidered* at all, or *not* in their *Iuſt weights and meaſures*. For as Mr. *Thorndike* well obſerues; *To charge* *Iuſt weights chap. 1.*

the Church *of Rome with Idolatry, it is Neceſſary to provide that we contradict not our ſelues. It is neceſſary alſo to conſider the importance and conſequence of it; Whether the reaſon of the diſtance amount to ſo heauy a charge or not. It is neceſſary that we vnderſtand our ſelues, whether we admit the conſequence of our own Suppoſition or not.* And to let you ſee that Dr. St. hath *not conſidered* nor *prouided* for theſe things, and conſequently *failed* in his *Defence*, I ſhall deſire you to *conſider* in the firſt place that whoeuer will vndertake to *maintain* this *charge*, muſt at the ſame time *profeſſ, that* Chriſt, *who commanded vs vnder pain of damnation to hear his* Church, *hath permitted Her to require and enioyn her* Children *for many hundreds of years together, to commit Idolatry paralel* (as Dr. St contends) *to that of the Heathens.*

2*dly. That Mahomet* (*that Grand Impoſtor*) *whoſe Followers haue been preſerued by the grounds he layd, for aboue a thouſand years from falling into Idolatry, had more wiſdome and Power to contriue and carry on his deſign, than the Son of God.* And 3*dly. that our Fore-Fathers in this Land, had better haue*

been converted to Iudaiſm or Turciſm, than to Chriſtianity as they were. Theſe are things which muſt needs ſtrike horrour into the *Soul* of any *Chriſtian* as often as he repeats thoſe words of his *Creed, I beleeue the Holy Catholick Church, if* he conſider what he ſayes; and firmly *beleeues* that *Chriſt* himſelf hath promiſed to be with his diſciples alwaies euen to the end of the world: and ſend the *Holy Ghoſt, to guide them into all truth*, and that *the Gates of Hell ſhall neuer preuail againſt his Church*; and being laid down by T. G in his *Epiſtle Dedicatory* as following from the *charge of Idolatry*, ought not Dr. St. when he vndertakes to *maintain* it, to haue *remoued* them in the *firſt* place, and not paſſed them ouer in *ſilence?* What can ſuch a *Silence* argue, but that he declined them as too true to be refuted? And now *pleaſe* your ſelf if you can in the *charge* of *Idolatry*.

Cathar. Perhaps theſe things appear not ſuch horrible *Bugbears* to *all*, as you would *make* them. We know *that excellent Seruant of God Caluin* (as the Dr. repreſents him in his *Irenicum*) maintains in the *Preface* to his *Inſtitutions*, that *Iren. p.* 405.

God had ſuffered men for their unthankfulneſſ to be drowned in deep darkneſſ, ſo that there was no Face of the true Church *to be ſeen.* And et is no new thing to find among vs Godly Perſons who (as your *Peter Heylin* obſerues) look vpon *the Religion of Rome, as worſe than that of the Turks and Moors, and hold conformity to them in Rites and Ceremonies more tolerable than to thoſe of Rome.* But how farr this *Silence* of Dr. Sts. *argues* his *conſent* to theſe Points, I cannot determin. I wonder he should neither *grant* nor *deny* them, yet now I think on't, I remember that in his *Defence* he doth *deny it follows from the charge of Idolatry, that the Gates of Hell haue prevaild againſt the* Church, when he askes T. G. upon his *obiecting* it to him, *Againſt what* Church? *the whole* Christian Church? *Whoeuer ſaid they could, or how doth that follow?* which I take to be the *ſame* as to *deny* it *doth* or *can* follow.

Cypr. Angl. p. 391.

p. 141.

Eun. And ſo do I too. But then, if it be as you ſay, that *Dr. St. denyes it to follow from the charge of Idolatry that the Gates of Hell haue prevailed againſt the whole Chriſtian Church*, ought he not to haue *aſſigned* vs ſome *Church*,

distinct in all Ages from all *Heretical* and *Idolatrous* Congregations, which *Christ* hath preserued allwaies from *heresy* and *Idolatry?*

Cathar. Not at all, if he be of Mr. *Calvin's* mind (*that Excellent Servant of God*) that there was a time when the *Face of the true Church was not to be seen.*

Eun. But what if Dr. St. *assert* (as he doth in his *Roman Idolatry*) that *a Christian by vertue of his being so, is bound to ioyn in some Church or Congregation of Christians*, doth it not follow, that there *must* be *such a Church* at all times to *joyn* with? And that *those* who in any time did *not ioyn* with it, acted against their *very Christianity*, by *vertue* of which they were *bound* to do it? Let him then *assign* vs such a *Church* in the world before *Luther*, to which *all Christians* by vertue of their *being* so, *were bound to ioyn in Communion*; or els he must grant that the *Gates of Hell had then prevailed against the whole Christian Church.* pag. 1.

Cathar. This Principle of the Drs. viz *that a Christian by vertue of his being so, is bound to ioyn in some Church*

or Congregation of Christians, I confeſſ, hath always ſeem'd odd to me. But I am very well aſſured, he will *not aſſign* the *Roman* to be *that Church*, becauſe in that very place he expreſsly affirms, that *the Gates of Hell do certainly prevail againſt the Church of Rome, if it doth un-church all other Christians that are not of it's Communion*: as certainly it doth.

Defence. p. 141.

Eun. But if the Dr. ſome leaues before, viz, pag. 785. *allow the Church of Rome to be a true Church, as holding all the Eſſential Points of Faith*, what does he mean now by telling us that *the Gates of Hell haue prevailed againſt it*? Do you not ſee into what *turnings* and *windings* they are driven, who will take upon them to maintain this *Charge* of *Idolatry*? Such frequent dizzineſs giues cauſe to ſuſpect, that the Point of the *Lance* hath paſs'd beyond the *Teeth* of the *Dragon*.

Cathar. No ſuch matter. For a *Church* may hold all the *Eſſential* Points of Faith, and yet the Gates of Hell prevail againſt it for it's Tyranny in un-churching all other Chriſtians, who are not of its Communion.

Eun. It is not then the meer *holding* and *teaching Idolatry inconsistent* (*as* the Dr. saith) *with salvation*, for which the *Gates* of *Hell* haue prevail'd against the *Church* of *Rome*, but her *Severity* in removing those from her Communion, who will not *conform* to her doctrin. But what euer the cause be, if the *Gates* of *Hell* haue prevailed against it, the Dr. is obliged by his Principles to assign some *other Church*, which *Christians by vertue of their being so are bound to joyn in Communion with*; and if he can *assign* none such, he must *grant* that *the Gates of Hell haue prevailed against the whole Christian Church.*

Cathar. Whateuer he *can* or *may* do in this matter, (and I see by *his Principles* he is bound to *doe* it) I am very much pleased with a Question, which I remember he *often requested*, and *insisted* vpon so earnestly as to coniure the *Lady* whose satisfaction he endeavoured, to intercede *if not for her own sake, yet for his, to procure of T. G. that he might know one reason at least, why the Beleeving all the Ancient Creeds, and leading a Good life, may not be sufficient*

to ſaluation, vnleſſ one be of the Communion of the Church of Rome?

Eun. I beleeue I gheſſ the *reaſon* why you are ſo pleaſed with *this Queſtion*: as ſuppoſing there lyes at the bottome of it, that *the Beleeuing the Ancient Creeds, and Leading a Good life, may* be *ſufficient* to ſalvation without *communicating* with *any Church* at all. But I know not whether you will be as much pleaſed with the *Anſwer.* For whereas Dr. St. had reproached T. G. that *he had often requeſted an anſwer to this Queſtion, but could not procure it* T. G. tells him, that had he pleaſed to haue taken notice of it, *he had done it in his firſt paper, as farr as was pertinent to the preſent purpoſe* (that is *in handling the* 2d *Queſtion, where it came in order*) *where Dr. St. grants, that a Chriſtian by vertue of his being ſo, is bound to ioyn in ſome Church and to chuſe the Communion of the Pureſt.* Where vpon ſaith T. G. *I ſubioyned, that that Church was to be iudged the pureſt, which had the ſtrongeſt Motives for it, and then laid down a Catalogue of ſuch weighty motiues for the Roman-Catholick, allowed by Dr. Taylor* (*lib. of*

Cath. no Idol. p. 5.

Proph. Sect. 20). *that neither Dr. St. in his Defence, nor Dr Taylor himſelf when he had a mind to invalidate them, produced any thing to weigh againſt them, but a few Tinſel-words, and one Scripture-Teſtimony, interpreted by and according to their own fancy.* But then again, becauſe Dr. St. *paſsed* this *Anſwer* by, as not worth his taking notice of, T. G. not to be wanting to ſo earneſt a *Requeſt*, proceeded to adde *three reaſons* more to the former to proue the *Roman Church* to be *that*, with which *all* are *bound* by vertue of their *Chriſtianity* to ioyn in communion: And I ſhall giue you *them* in order as they lye.

1. *There was in the world before Luther a diſtinct Church, whoſe Communion was neceſſary to Saluation; but this was not the Proteſtant; Therefore it was the Roman. The Maior,* ſaith he, *is euident from Dr. St's. own Confeſſion, that a Chriſtian by vertue of his being ſo, is bound to ioyn in ſome Church; which is not poſſible, if there be not ſuch a Church to ioyn with. The Minor alſo, that this was not the Proteſtant, is manifeſt, becauſe before Luther there was*

no such Church in the world distinct from the Roman. It follows therefore, saith he (the Question between Dr. St. and him, being supposed to be of the necessity of Communion either with the Roman, or with the Protestant) that of the two the Roman Church was, and still is (as remaining still the same) that Church, whose Communion is necessary to salvation.

2. Again, saith he; taking the term Roman-Church, not only for the Particular Diocess of Rome, but for the Churches also in Communion with it, as the Head, (as it is generally taken in this Controversy) nothing can render her Communion not necessary to salvation, but either Heresy, that is, an adhesion to some private or singular Opinion or Errour in Faith; Or Schism, that is separation from former Ecclesiasticall unity. For the first, he saith, that Dr. St. himself (Rat. Account, p. 54.) acknowledges the Church of Rome to beleive all the same Articles of Faith with the Protestant; and that the Points in which the Protestant differs from the Roman, are not Articles of Faith. Consequently the Opposite Tenets to them can be no

Errours in Faith with him. And for the ſecond, if he will make the Church of Rome guilty of Schiſm, he muſt aſſign ſome other diſtinct Church, (then at leaſt in being) from whoſe vnity She departed: which T. G. *thinkes* he ſaith, *was neuer pretended, and makes himſelf ſure can neuer be performed.*

Cathar: T. G. is no good Undertaker for what his Adverſary *can* or *cannot* performe in this point. But t'is euident the *Church* of *Rome* hath giuen *iuſt cauſe* for other Churches to withdraw themſelues from her *Communion*, by impoſing *new* Articles of *Faith*, and ſome of them *Idolatrous*. And this makes the *crime* of the *Schiſm* to lye at her door.

Eun. This Obiection T. G. foreſaw, and *three* things he ſaith to it. 1. *that this is the Common Plea of all Separatiſts*, viz *to charge thoſe from whom they ſeparated with bringing in new doctrines. 2. that it implyes an acknowledgment of the Fact of Schiſm, that is, of breaking Church-Vnity to be on the Proteſtants ſide, 3. that this being ſo, the Proteſtants ſtand arraigned of the crime of Schiſm alſo, for breaking Com-*

munion with the Church of Rome, vntill the Accusation be made good, and iudged to be so, by some other more competent Iudge than themselues in their own cause.

p. 9. 3. The third and last argument prest sed by T. G. *why the beleiuing all the Ancient creeds, and leading a good life, may not be sufficient to saluation, vnlesse one be of the Communion of the Church of Rome* is this *A Christian by vertue of his being so, is bound to be of the Communion of that Church, which euidently was the true one, and the purest; vntill it be as euidently at least (if not more euidently) proued not to be so; for otherwise he wrongs both his Reason and conscience, if he leaue a greater euidence and adhere to a lesser. But the Roman Church, as comprehending all those in Communion with her by the Testimony not only of S. Paul (Rom. c. 1. and c. 16) but of the whole Christian world of all Ages, was euidently once the only true Church of Christ, and consequently, the Purest; and neither hath it, nor can it be as euidently, (much lesse more euidently) proued not to be so still; since the Testimony of those who do or will*

deny it, is incomparably Short of the former. Therefore ſaith T. G. *a Chriſtian by vertue of his being ſo is bound to be of the Communion of the Roman Church.*

Theſe are the *reaſons* which T. G. gaue to Dr. St's *demand*, and ſaith, he *heartily prayes they may do him good, becauſe he requeſted ſo earneſtly to know them for his own ſake*; and I cannot but *wonder* that the Dr. hauing ſo earneſtly *requeſted* them, and ſo feelingly *complained* that he could not *procure* them, now that they are giuen, ſhould paſs them alſo by in *Silence* and take *no notice* of them.

Cathar. I fear you think *theſe arguments* conclude, that *Communion* with the *Church* of *Rome* is *neceſſary* to *ſalvation*, and I ſhould be loath to hear ſo *convincing* an argument of your *Inclination* to *Popery*.

Eun. You do not hear me ſay *ſo*; and yet I cannot but look upon them, as coming ſo *home* to the *Point*, that unleſs anſwered, they carry all before them and quite ruine the *Cauſe* of the *Reformation*. And although perhaps you will not confeſs ſo much, yet I

perceiue by your discourse, you are not so well *pleased* either with the *Arguments* of T. G. or Dr. St's *silence*, as you were with the Question. However there is one thing added by T.G. which I think you wil not be *displeased* with: and that is a *Reflexion* he makes, that *whereas it hath been hitherto speciously*
1. 9. 10. *pretended against the* Church *of Rome, that the beleeuing all the Ancient* Creeds, *and leading a good life, is all that is necessary to saluation, yet now there is more required by Dr. St.* Viz, *to ioyn in some* Church *or* Congregation *of Christians, by vertue of a man's being a* Christian; *and that he is bound to chuse the* Communion *of the Purest: by which* T. G. saith, *he will suppose he meanes at present the* Church *of England:* and thereupon *hopes he may without Offence take the same liberty with Dr. St. which Dr St. had done with him, and desire if not for his own sake, yet for the sake of the Presbyterians, Anabaptists, and other separated* Congregations, *to know one reason from him, why the beleeuing all the Ancient* Creeds, *and leading a good life may not be sufficient to salvation vnless one be of the* Communion *of the* Church

of England? This you ſee how it was *preſs'd* by T. G. after he had giuen his *reaſons* to Dr. St's *demand*; but the Dr. has not been ſo mutually *kind* as to *deſert* to ſo earneſt a *requeſt* in his *Defence*.

Cathar. Perhaps he looked vpon it as an *impertinent Digreſſion*.

Eun. So himſelf alſo feared *he ſhould be thought to digreſs when he propoſed the Queſtion to T. G.* and yet could neuer be at reſt till he had *procured* an anſwer from him. Why then ought he not to haue done the *ſame*, when if there were any *digreſſion*, himſelf was the *Author* of it. *Rem. Idol. p. 50.*

Cathar. Perhaps it *ſuited* not with his *Circumſtances*, yet I could *wish* he had *done* it, becauſe then I ſuppoſe we ſhould haue ſeen with how much *greater Juſtice* the *Church* of *England* exacts *Cõmunion with her* from *other* Churches, than the *Church* of *Rome*. Which *hitherto* I confeſſe I haue not been able to *diſcern*, and that for a *reaſon* offered formerly to *Conſideration* by Dr. St. himſelf in his Irenicum pag. 117. where hauing laid down *this* Propoſition viz. [*where any Church retaining purity of Doctrine doth require the owning of and conforming*

to any vnlawfull or ſuſpected practice; Men may lawfully deny conformity to, and Communion with that Church in ſuch things, without the guilt of Schiſm] he endeavours to *iuſtify* it from the *lawfulneſſe* of *ſeparation* from the *Church* of *Rome*, in this manner. *If our ſeparation from the Church of Rome was therefore lawful, becauſe ſhe required vnlawful things as conditions of her Communion; then whereuer ſuch things are required by any Church* (as we ſay they are by the Church of England) *non-Communion with that Church in thoſe things will be lawful too, and where non-communion is lawful, there can be no Schiſm in it. If it be ſaid here* (he means, I ſuppoſe, by the *Prelates* of the *Church* of *England*) that *the Pope's Power was an vſurpation, which is not in lawful Governours of Churches; it is ſoon replied* ſaith he, *that the Pope's vſurpation mainly lyes in impoſing things vpon men's Conſciences, as neceſſary, which are doubtfull or vnlawful. And whereuer the ſame thing is done, there is an vſurpation of the ſame nature, though not in ſo high a degree: and it may be as lawful to withdraw*

Iren. p. 118.

Communion from one, as well as the othre.

Eun: But may it not be ſaid, that *Men are bound to be ruled by their Governours, in determining what things are lawful and what not?*

Cathar. To this it is anſwered by Dr. St. firſt *that no true Proteſtant can ſwear blind Obedience to Church-Governours in all things. That euery one hath a* Judicium priuatæ diſcretionis, *which is the Rule of practice as to himſelf: and though we freely allow a Miniſteriall Power vnder Chriſt in the Governours of the Church, yet that extends not to an obligation vpon men to go againſt the dictates of their own reaſon and conſcience. Their power is only directiue, and declarative, and in matters of duty can bind no more than reaſon and euidence brought from Scripture by them doth.* Again *if the Governours muſt be Judges, what things are lawful what not, their power will be abſolute; for to be ſure whatſoeuer they command, they will ſay is lawful either in it's ſelf, or as they command it: If euery priuate perſon muſt iudge what is lawfull, what not, which is commanded;* (*as when all is*

ſaid, euery man will be his own Iudge in this caſe, in things concerning his own welfare) then he is no further bound to obey, than he iudgeth the thing to be lawful which is commanded. And for the plea of an erroneous conſcience, that takes not off the obligation to follow the dictates of it: for as he is bound to lay it down, ſuppoſing it erroneous; ſo he is bound not to go againſt it while it is not laid down. But then again - *Did not the Pope plead to be a lawfull Gouernour? And if men are bound to ſubmit to the determination of Church-Gouernours, as to the lawfulneſſe of things, they were bound to beleeue him in that as well as other things, and ſo ſeparation from that Church* (that is, the Church of Rome) *was vnlawfull then.* Where vpon he concludes, that *let men turn and wind themſelues, which way they will, by the very ſame Arguments, that any will proue Separation from the Church of Rome lawful, becauſe she required vnlawful things, as conditions of her Communion, it will be proued lawful, not to conform to any ſuſpected or vnlawfull practice, required by any Church-Gouernours, vpon the ſame terms? if the thing ſo re-*

quired, be after ſerious and ſober inquiry, iudged vnwarrantable by a Man's own Conſcience. Laſtly, he addes, *that withall, it would be further conſidered, whether when our beſt Writers againſt the Papiſts do lay the imputation of Schiſm, not on thoſe who withdraw Communion, but on them for requiring ſuch conditions of Communion (whereby they did rather eiect men out of their Communion, than the others ſeparate from them) they do not by the ſame argument, lay the Imputation of Schiſm on all, who require ſuch conditions of Communion, and take it wholly off from thoſe, who refuſe to conform for Conſcience ſake:* And much more to the *ſame* purpoſe, which for breuities ſake I omit to repeat.

Eun. Now I perceiue *what* it is you would be at; you would haue had Dr. St. *anſwer* his *own* argument. A very vngrateful employement I can aſſure you, for either he cannot *abſolue* you from the *crime* of *Schiſm*, or he muſt *deny* (which I am ſure you will not) that the *Church* of *England* impoſes any *doubtful* and *ſuſpected practices*, as *conditions* of *Communion* with her, yet

if I miſtake not, he hath offered ſomething to this purpoſe in his *Rational Account* pag. 54. where he lays down the *State* of the difference between the *Church* of *Rome* and the *Church* of *England* in theſe words. *The Church of Rome*, ſaith he, *impoſeth new Articles of Faith to be beleeued as neceſſary to ſalvation. But the Church of England makes no Articles of Faith, but ſuch as haue the Teſtimony and Approbation of the whole Chriſtian world of all ages, and are acknowledged to be ſuch by Rome it ſelf; and in other things ſhe requires ſubſcription to them, not as Articles of Faith, but as Inferiour Truths, or as Dr. Bramhall calls them pious Opinions fitted for the Preſervation of Vnity, not*, ſaith he, *that we oblige any man to beleeue them, but only not to oppoſe or contradict them.* How farr this *Anſwer* may *relish* with you, *Catharinus*, as implying the *Guilt* of *Schiſm* to be on your ſide for denying Conformity to ſo *moderate* a condition, as non-contradicting only is, I leaue to your conſideration. But the vſe that T. G. makes of it, is to ſhew that Dr. St. was not *wel adviſed* vpon *theſe* Principles, to

vndertake the *charge* of *Idolatry* againſt the *Church* of *Rome*. In order to which he firſt lays down the *Senſe* of what the Dr. affirms in theſe words. *This* ſaith he *according* to Dr. St. *is the Baſis and Foundation of the Proteſtant Religion, that no doctrine of the Proteſtant Religion, as it differs from that of the Roman, is an Article of Faith; that is, that no Proteſtant believes; or if he do, he ought not to believe, as a matter of Faith, viz. that the Images of Chriſt and his Saints, are not to be honoured; that the Subſtance of the Bread is not changed in to the Body of Chriſt; that the Saints in heauen are not to be invoked to pray for vs. But all that he is obliged to by the Church of England, is not to oppoſe or contradict them.* And then inferrs theſe *Conſequences* from the Dr's *Aſſertion.*

1. *That the Church of Rome according to him, doth not erre againſt any Article of Faith, becauſe the Church of England, as he ſaith, makes no Articles of Faith, but ſuch as are acknowledged to be ſuch by Rome it ſelf.* Cath. no Idol. p. 14.

2. *That himſelf doth not believe any of the aforeſaid Points as they are determined by the Church of England.*

to be Articles of Faith: because to be Articles of Faith with him they must haue, the Testimony and Approbation of the whole Christian world of all Ages, and be acknowledged to be such by Rome it self; which certainly the *English Articles* concerning the *worshipping of Images, the Adoration of the Host*, and *the Inuocation of Saints*, are not,

3. *That after all this bustle to make the Church of Rome guilty of Idolatry in these very Points, for ought any man knows, himself gines no Interiour Assent to any of the fore-mentioned Tenets (as determined by the Church of England) not euen as to Inferiour Truths, or Pious Opinions, because the Church of England doth not oblige any man to beliene them as such, but only not to oppose or contradict them: and it is not likely*, saith T. G. *he defers more to the Church of England, than She obliges him to* (or than *he* conceiues *She* obliges him to.)

4. And lastly, *that this Charge of Idolatry against the Church of Rome is vain and groundlesse; because Idolatry being an Errour against the most Fundamentall Point* of *Faith, and the Church of Rome according to him, not*

erring against any Article of Faith, t'is euident, ſaith T. G. that to charge the Church of Rome with Idolatry muſt according to his own Principles be the moſt groundleſſ, vnreaſonable, and contradictory proceeding in the world.

This done he deſires euery indifferent Reader to reflect and iudge whether Dr. St. to render the doctrine of the 39 Articles digeſtible (as he phraſes it) to the moſt ſqueamish ſtomack of the Niceſt Non-Conformist, haue not done a notable peice of Seruice to the Church of England in degrading ſo many of them, as are not acknowledged by the Church of Rome (although they be eſteemed the diſtinctiue badge of the Purity of the Church of England) from the dignity of being Articles of Faith, into a lower Claſs of Inferiour Truths (as he calls them) ſuch as neither himſelf, nor any body els knows, whether they haue a grain of truth in them, or no; and conſequently are not bound to beliene them? Nay, ſaith he, Doth he not vndermine the Church of England, both in her doctrine and Government? In her doctrine, by freeing her ſubiects from any obligation of interiour belieuing her Articles, ſo farr forth as they differ from

thoſe of the Church of Rome to be ſo much as inferiour Truth? In her Government, by expoſing her Ordination, (or Publik Miniſtery) *to be invaded without ſcruple, by ſuch as in their hearts iudge it Anti-Chriſtian. when he tells them, her Senſe is to oblige them no farther, than not to oppoſe or contradict it?* In which by the way I think he *diſſents* as much from the *Senſe* of the *Church* of *England*, if that be to be taken from the publick *Acts* of her *Convocations*, as in his *charge* of *Idolatry*. But to proceed with T. G. *Was it not worth the while*, ſaith he, *to rend aſunder the peace of Chriſtendome for a Company of Opinions, which* (*though Dr. Bramhal call them Pious, yet* (*the greater part of Chriſtians, both in the Eaſt and Weſt for many Ages haue, and do condemn for Impious and Blaſphemous? Is not this*, ſaith he, *a very Rational, or rather* (*as Mr. I. S. expounds the word*) *a very Reaſonable Account of the grounds of the Proteſtant Religion, and a rare way of Juſtifying her from the guilt of Schiſm? Surely he neuer thought of charging the Church of Rome with Idolatry, when he layd ſuch ſandy Principles*

ciples of ſo brittle a Temper, that it was not poſſible they ſhould bear ſo great a charge, without breaking and diſcharging vpon himſelf.

This and much more to the *ſame* purpoſe (which I may haue occaſion to mind you of hereafter, is vrged by T. G. and I could wish Dr. St. would haue *digreſſed* ſo farr, as to shew the conſiſtency of his *Charge* of *Idolatry* with *theſe* Principles; though he had ſpared the giving vs a *digreſſion* of *neer two hundred Pages* together in the *firſt* chapter of his *defence* about the *worſhip* both of the *Ancient* and *Modern Heathens*; which when all is done ſignifies iuſt nothing to the making of a *Paralell* with that of the *Church* of *Rome*, as will be very eaſily made appear.

Cathar. As for the *digreſſion* (as you call it) it is not our concern at preſent to engage in it. It lyes at his *Aduerſaries* door; and ſo doth the *Imputation* of *Schiſm* at the *Church* of *Englands*, on the ſame account, as on the *Church* of *Rome's*, while she impoſes *doubtful* and *Suſpected Practices* as *conditions* of her *Communion*. But for the *conſe-*

quences T. G. inferrs from the *difference* laid down by Dr. St. between the *Church* of *England* and that of *Rome* he hath ſufficiently shown the *vanity* of *one* of them. viz. the 4th in the *laſt* Chapter of *his Defence*, where 1ſt he ſaith that *to affirm that the Church of Rome doth not erre in any Fundamental Point of the Chriſtian Faith, and yet may be guilty of Idolatry*, hath *no contradiction* in it; *for the notion of Idolatry, as applyed to the Church* of *Rome, is conſiſtent with it's owning the General Principles of Faith, as to the true God and Jeſus-Chriſt, and giuing Soueraign Worship to them.* 2. Whereas T. G. ſaith, that *Idolatry is an Errour againſt the moſt Fundamentall Point of Faith*, Dr. St. replies that *T. G. himſelf confeſſes the true Notion of Idolatry to be, the giving the worship due to God to a Creature: And ſo, if Dr. St. haue proued that the worship of Images in the Roman Church be the giuing the worship due only to God to a Creature, then although the Church of Rome may hold all the Eſſentials of Faith and be a true Church, yet may it be guilty of Idolatry without contradiction.*

Eun. I was very well *aware* of this, but did not belieue your ſelf would take it for an *anſwer*, eſpecially ſeing he ſaith nothing at all to the *Three* firſt, which plainly euince he cannot maintain his *charge* of *Idolatry* without *contradicting* himſelf. And if *this* you alledge be *all* he hath to *ſay* to the 4th I thinke he hath but *ſpun* a *webb to entangle* himſelf the more. For his Aduerſaries will ſoon reply, that in prouing the *Church* of *Rome* to be *guilty* of *Idolatry* he proues her at the ſame time *to erre againſt a Fundamental Article of Faith*: vnleſſe he will *deny*, (which I am ſure you will not) the *doctrine* of the 2d *Commandment* to be a *Fundamental Article*, or that to *teach* the *oppoſite* to it, is *not* to *erre* againſt it.

Cathar. But Dr. St. *being*, as he ſaith, *afraid to be ſnap'd by ſuch cunning Sophiſters, hath therefore diſtinguished in time*, viz. *that to affirm a Church* to hold any *Idolatry lawfull*, which it *iudges* to be *Idolatry* and *not erre* againſt a *Fundamental* Point, would be a *contradiction*. But to ſay, that *it may entertain a falſe notion of Idolatry*, or p. 719.

of that worship which is due only to God, and not erre against any Fundamental, is *none*: for *this false notion being received, men may really giue the worship that belongs only to God to his creatures. And this* saith he, *is the vtmost errour necessary in this case.*

Eun. This I take to be the vtmost, which Dr. St. can say in *this* case: And when I consider the *distinction* he giues, methinkes I am more clearly conuinc'd of the truth of that *Sage* saying of his (though ill applied his Aduersary I. W. for *his distinction* of *expressely* or *implicitely*,) viz *that Mother-wit is much*
p. 791. *better than Scholastick Fooling.* For if my *Mother-wit fail me not*; to *erre*, in the strictest way of speaking, (though it be used also to signify any *Opposition* to Truth) is *not* so properly to *oppose the Truth, knowing it to be the Truth*, as to *teach that which is opposite to truth in reality, the Teacher not knowing it to be so.* And if the *Church* of *Rome erre* in telling men, that *the Honour She giues to the Images of Christ and his Saints is not a part of the Honour due to God, if in reality it be a part of his Honour*, 'tis

Euident *She erres* againſt the 2d *Commandment*, though she iudges she doth *not*. So that which way ſoeuer the Dr. *turns* himſelf, he cannot *maintain* the *Church* of *Rome* to be *guilty* of *Idolatry* without *erring* againſt a *Fundamental Point*. And that this Errour is *damnable*, is avowed by himſelf in his *very charge*, when he *aſſerteth, that thoſe who Communicate with the Church of Rome, muſt by the terms of Communion with her be guilty either of Hypocriſy or Idolatry, either of which*, ſaith he, *are ſins inconſiſtent with ſaluation.*

Cathar. But ſtill methinks you come not *home* to the *Point*. For what the Dr. *fixes* himſelf vpon p. 787. *is* that *the Notion of Idolatry as applyed to the Church of Rome* (mark that) *is conſiſtent with its owning the General Principles of Faith, as to the true God and Jeſus Chriſt, and giving Soueraign worſhip to them*, that is, if I vnderſtand him aright, that *the Church of Rome* may *teach* in the *General* that *Soueraign worſhip* is *due only to the true God and Jeſus Chriſt*, and yet *giue the real parts of worſhip due only to God to a meer*

creature, in worshipping him by an *Image*, (which is the *notion* of *Idolatry* he *applyes* to *that Church*) and yet again at the same time tell men, *it is not a part of the Honour which is due to God*, as *not iudging* it to be such.

Eun. Well, if this be the *Point*, I think I haue spoken sufficiently to *it* already. But to make it yet *plainer*, I must desire you to reflect, that the *Controuersy* here is not only vpon a *General Thesis* whether some *Idolatrous Practice* may not *consist* with *owning* the *General Principles of Faith as to the true God and Jesus Christ, and giuing. Soueraign worship to them* (which yet I know not, how himself can *maintain* against I W's distinction of *expressly* or *implicitely*, when he 'supposes the
p. 788. *Church* of *Rome* to *debauch the very essential Principles of Faith by damnable errours, and to corrupt the worship of God by vertue of them*) but vpon a *particular Hypothesis*, viz, whether the *notion* of *Idolatry*, *as applyed to the Church of Rome*,) i.e. the *worshipping* of *God* by an *Image*) be *consistent with*, that is, be *not* an *errour* against the

doctrine of the 2d Commandment, if that be, to *forbid* men to *worship him* by an *Image?* The *Affirmative* of this I think is too manifeſt to be *denyed* by any man that hath not loſt his *Mother-Wit*. And therefore if it be *a Fundamental Point* to *believe that to be Idolatry*, which *God* himſelf hath *expreſsly forbidden* in the *law* vnder the *notion of Idolatry* and that be, the *worshipping* of *him* by an *Image* (as Dr. St. aſſerts) t'is *cleer* that the *Church* of *Rome in telling men it is not Idolatry* (as not *knowing* it to be ſuch) *erres* againſt a *Fundamentall Point*; and *he* cannot according to *his Principles* maintain his *charge* of *Idolatry* without a *Contradiction*. For if it be *expreſsly revealed* in H. *Scripture*, that *to worship God by an Image is Idolatry*, it is an *Article of Faith*, and a *Fundamental* One too, and the *Church* of *Rome* in teaching men to *do ſo*, *erres* againſt *it*. And if Dr. St. with the *Church* of *England* make *no Articles of Faith*, *but ſuch as are acknowledged to be ſuch by Rome it ſelf* (as this is *not*) according to him it *is no Article of Faith at all*, that God is

not to be *worshipped* by an *Image*. This I take to be *Contradiction* enough, and the Dr. must clear himself from it as he *can*.

p. 785. *Cathar.* This is what a man gets by *dropping*, (as Dr. St. saith vpon *this* occasion) *some kind words towards them who will be sure to make all possible advantages from them, to ouerthrow the force of whatever can be said afterwards against them.* Had he not been so *kind hearted* as to *allow* the *Church* of *Rome* to be *a true Church*, and *hold all the Essential Points of Christian Faith*, but had *stood firm* to the *Principles* of our *Party*, who look vpon *that Church*, *not as a true Church*, but as the *Synagogue* of *Antichrist*, he had *done* the *work* throughly, and freed himself from the intangling *Sophisms* of these *Scholastick Foolers.*

Eun. I think you haue *little reason* to esteem T. G. for *one* of *them who make all possible aduantages from the Dr's kind words to ouerthrow the force of whatever might or was, said afterwards against him*, if you consider how *exact* he was afterwards in replying to *all his arguments*, whereas

whereas the Dr. in his Defence hath *paſſed* ouer many *important* things obiected by T. G. (as you haue heard) without taking *notice* at all of *them*. But in the *main*, I ſee by what you ſay, you *agree* ſo farr with me, that Dr. St. was not *well-aduiſed* to *charge* the *Church* of *Rome* with *Idolatry* vpon *his Principles*. Nor am I leſſ *diſſatisfied* with his *managing* it, vpon ſome *other Accounts*, which I ſhall *acquaint* you with at our next meeting.

THE FOVRTH DIALOGVE.

THE ARGUMENT.

MR. Thorndike's Judgment of the Charge of Idolatry, with Dr. St's. Honourable Encomium of him. Instead of iustifying the Separation, he brings the Guilt of the Schism vpon himself and the Church of England. A farther display of his Omissions and Contradictions. His Paralel between the worship of the Heathens, and that of the Church of Rome shown to be Impertinent, and the Worship of God by an Image not to be expressly prohibited in the 2d Commandment.

CATHARINVS, EVNOMIVS

Cathar. I remember at the beginning of our *discourse*, you desir'd me to *consider* you vnder the quality of a *Person perfectly of Mr. Thorndik's Judgment, as to the* Charge *of Idolatry*

vpon the Church of Rome : and that what you should produce vpon that account, should be either from *his* own words, or what you conceiued himſelf *muſt* and *would* haue ſaid in conformity to *his Principles*, And I was willing to entertain *this conceit* of you; but cannot perſwade my ſelf, that ſo *learned* and *Judicious* a Man, as Mr. *Thorndike* is eſteemed, would haue allowed ſo much *partiality*, as you haue shown in *this cauſe* both to T. G. and the *Church* of *Rome*.

Eun. This is what I *expected* all along to hear from you. And though I haue not the *other* works of that *Learned* Perſon by me, yet I may hope to *acquit* my ſelf ſufficiently of *this* Imputation with his *Juſt weights and meaſures*.

For firſt if the *Queſtion* be of the *charge* it ſelf of *Idolatry*, it is manifeſt that Mr. *Thorndike* excuſes the *Doctrine* and *Profeſſion* of the *Church* of *Rome* (from whence we are to take the *terms* of *Communion* with it) from *Idolatry*, in all the *three Points* obiected by Dr. St. viz, The *worshipping* of *Images*, and the *Adoration* of the *Hoſt* in the 19th Chapter; and *the Invocation of Saints* in the 16th.

Of the first he saith, that *to the Images of Saints there can be no Idolatry, so long as men take them for Saints, that is, Gods creatures; much lesse to the Images of our Lord, for it is the honour of our Lord and not of his Image. And although,* saith he, *the 2d Council of Nice acknowledges that the Image it self is honoured, by the honour giuen to that which it signifieth before the Image, yet it distinguisheth this honour from the honour of our Lord: and therefore teacheth not Idolatry, by teaching to honour Images, though it acknowledge that the Image it self is honoured, when it need not.* Of the 2d he affirmeth that *the worship of the Host in the Papacy is not Idolatry, because those who worship the Host, do not believe that the Elements remain, but that our Lord Christ, the only true God is present there in a particular manner.* For the 3d though he seem more *Scrupulous* in *that* than the *other two*, because *the same things* he saith, *are desired of the Saints, and in the same terms, in which they are desired of God, euen in the Holy Scripture,* yet he acknowledges *there is a Profession of that Church extant, which contradicts*

the proper ſenſe of ſuch prayers, and forces the Addreſſers of them, vnleſs they will contradict themſelues, to expound them to ſignify no more, than obtaining that of God, which they are deſired to grant of themſelues. And this he *implies* to be *ſufficient* to *excuſe* them from *Idolatry*, when he ſayes, that *were it not ſo, they could not be excuſed from it.*

Again, if the *Queſtion* be concerning the *managing* the *Charge* of *Idolatry*, ſuppoſing or granting the *Church* of *Rome* to be *a true Church*, as Dr. St. doth. Mr. *Thorndike* expreſsly affirmeth in his 1. Chapter, that *if the Pope be Antichriſt, and the Papiſts Idolaters the Church of Rome is no true Church; and if it be a true Church, that which it profeſſeth, is not Idolatry*, and thereupon giues this *neceſſary caution* to *thoſe* who will proceed vpon *that* ſuppoſition, to *prouide that they contradict not themſelues*; which in his 2d Chapter he ſaith *they muſt doe*, i. e. contradict themſelues *if they maintain it.* 3dly if the *Queſtion* be of the *Senſe* of the *Church* of *England*, Mr. *Thorndike* ſhews from the very *fact* of the *Refo mation*, tha ti was not the meaning of thoſe who madc the

Change, to *charge* the *Church* of *Rome* with *Idolatry*, becauſe *that were to ſuppoſe it not to be a true Church*, and *the Church of England not to be the ſame Church with that which was*: whereas the *Reformation* was not *intended* for the making a *new Church*, which was *not* before, but *for the reſtoring a ſick Church to its ſoundneſs, and a corrupted Church to it's Purity*. Chapt. 1. and 3d

4thly if the *Queſtion* be, on which ſide the *crime* of *Schiſm* lyes, he affirms in the ſame firſt Chapter, that they that *ſeparate from the Church of Rome as Idolaters, are thereby Schiſmaticks before God*; and again, that *in plain terms we make our ſelues Schiſmaticks, by grounding our Reformation vpon this pretence*.

Laſtly, he aſſerteth the *Profeſſion of one Viſible Church, to oblige all to ſtand to thoſe grounds and thoſe terms, vpon which it is to be maintained* (of which certainly with him the *charge* of *Idolatry* is *none*) and that *he who takes the Pope for Antichriſt, and the Papiſts for Idolaters, can neuer weigh by his own Weights, and mete by his own meaſures, till he hate Papiſts worſe than*

Iews or Mahumetans; ch. 2. Theſe things being ſo, I hope you will *abſolue* me from the *Suſpition* of hauing aduanced any thing in this matter, but what Mr. *Thorndike* himſelf *allows*. The *Reaſons* he brings for *theſe Poſitions* you may ſee your ſelf at leaſure in the *Places* I haue cited.

Cath. You haue ſufficiently *acquitted* your ſelf of the *conceit* I began to haue of you: and Dr. St. ſeems to haue *acquitted* himſelf alſo ſufficiently, as to the *reſpect* due to the *memory* of ſo *learned* and *Pious* a Perſon (as himſelf acknowledges Mr. *Thorndike* to haue been) when he aſſures T. G. that *if he could haue thought, what that Learned Man had ſaid in this matter, to haue been agreable either to Scripture or Reaſon, or the ſenſe of the Primitiue, or of the preſent Church of England, it might haue prevented his writing, by changing his Opinion; for* he ſaith, *he was no ſtranger to his writings or his arguments.* By which you ſee, he came to them with a *good will* to be *informed* before he engaged in this *cauſe* and would not haue receded from *his Opinion*, could he haue *adhered* to it without *violence* to Def. p. 783.

his *Reaſon.*

Eun. This I know is returned by Dr. St. in his late defence. p. 783. in anſwer to T. G. who vpon occaſion of a diſcourſe of Mr. *Thorndike's*, about the *Senſe* of the 2d *Commandment*, diametrically oppoſite to that which Dr. St. giues, had ſaid, that he could not but look vpon it, as *a kind of Prophetical Confutation in the year 1662. of all which the Dr. had produced in the yeare 1671.* (when his Treatiſe of *Roman Idolatry* came forth) *for the proof of his charge of Idolatry againſt the* Church *of Rome in the matter of Images.* And how full of *reſpect* the Dr's anſwer is to the *Memory* of *that excellent* Perſon, your ſelf will iudge, if you conſider what an *honour* it is for Mr. *Thorndike*, for the world to hear it proclaimed from the *mouth* of Dr. St; that what he hath ſaid in this matter is in his Judgment *agreable* neither to *Scripture*, nor *Reaſon*, nor the *Senſe* of *the Primitiue Church*, nor of *his own*; and this after he had made himſelf no *Stranger* to *his writings*, or *his Arguments.* Do you not think that many will be apt to beleeue that there muſt be *none* of *all*

Cath. no Idol. p. 175.

theſe in *them*, when ſuch a Man as Dr. *St.* brought both *wit* and *will* to diſcouer them, but *could not*? But why did he not make it ſome part of his buſineſs to *anſwer* his *Arguments*, if he found them ſo void of *Senſe* and *Reaſon*, at leaſt thoſe which T. G. vrged againſt him, and, becauſe the Dr. left them vn-anſwered, ſaid he muſt look vpon Mr. *Thorndike's* Book, *as a Confutation of his before it was written*? Does not Mr. *Thorndike* himſelf in the 1. Chapter of his *Juſt Weights and Meaſures*, ſpeaking to *thoſe* of Dr. St's Judgment, demand, *if they can pretend ſo much charity to him, as to haue attempted the anſwering of his Reaſons, and the rectifying of his miſtakes? Or will they*, ſaith he, *ſhew me who hath anſwered them; and ſo, that they need not be troubled for me*? And now, when Mr. *Thorndike* himſelf ſo *charitably*, and T. G ſo *iuſtly* called vpon Dr. St. to *anſwer* his *arguments*, was it enough for him to *paſs* all this by with a *deaf ear*, and hauing profeſſed himſelf *no ſtranger* to the *writings*, and *arguments* of that *great* Man, to tell vs with an *Ipſe dixit*, that he could find neither

Scripture nor *Reason*, nor the *Sense* of the *Primitiue Church*, nor of *his own* in what *he* had said In *this matter*? You may beleiue as you please, but *those* of the *Church* of *England* haue a *different esteem* for him, and for *his* writings. What if T. G. should answer Dr. St's *defence* in the *same manner*, and with the *same* words, would you take it for *good payment*? For my part I should be *satisfied* with neither, nor will your self be, I beleeue, for what concerns Mr. *Thorndike*, when you shall haue heard what T. G. alledged out of *him*, to show the *crime* of *Schism* to *ly* at *their* doors, who *charge* the *Church* of *Rome* with *Idolatry*, and is left *vntouched* by Dr. St. both in his *General Preface*, and late *Defence*. That *this* was Mr. *Thorndike's* Judgment as to the *charge* of *Idolatry* in *general*, is euident from what I haue cited aboue out of his Firſt chapter; and for the *worship* of *images* in particular, in his 19th Chapter he ſaith, *It is manifeſt that the Church of God is tyed no farther than there can appear danger of Idolatry, which if it* be *ſo heightned, beyond appearance, as to involve the* Church *in*

Pref. to Cath. no Idol.

the crime of it (i. e. *Idolatry*) *chargeth the ſchiſm that may come by that meanes vpon them, that ſo inhanſe it.*

Cathar. This is a thing which I haue often *heard*, and allwayes with *wonder*; nothing appearing to me *ſo proper to iuſtify the Separation of the* Church *of England from that of Rome*, as the charging *that Church* with *Idolatry*: *for* (as Dr. St. himſelf giues the *reaſon* in his *Preface*) *whereas other things are ſubtile and nice, tedious and obſcure, this lyes plain to the conſcience of euery man: If the Church of Rome be guilty of Idolatry, our Separation can be no Schiſm, either before God or man, becauſe our* Communion *would be a Sin.* *Pref. to Rem. Idol.*

Eun. This *wonder* of yours proceeds from a *miſtake* (as you heard before) that *thoſe* who made the *change* intended a *Separation*; whereas *Reformation is indeed, and allwaies was the thing intended.* And for what you alledge from Dr. St. M. *Thorndike* confeſſes, *this cauſe* (i. e. Idolatry) *would be more then ſufficient to iuſtify ſeparation, did it appear to be true: but then on the othe ſide, ſaith he, it charges the miſchiefs of the Schiſm vpon thoſe* *Iuſt. weight. ch. 1.*

that proceed vpon it, before it be as euident as the miſchiefs are, which they run into vpon it. So that, ſhould the Church of England declare that the Change, which we call Reformation is grounded vpon this ſuppoſition, I muſt then acknowledg ſaith he, *that we are Schiſmaticks. For the cauſe not appearing to me (as hitherto it hath not, and I think will neuer be made to appear to me) the Separation, and the Miſchiefs of it muſt be imputed to them that make the change.* And therefore we (of the Church of England) *in plain terms make our ſelues Schiſmaticks, by grounding our Reformation vpon this Pretence.* This was returned by T. G. in his *Preface*, to Dr St. with this *reflexion*, that *this Judgment of Mr. Thorndike, abetted by diuers of the moſt learned, and moſt Judicious Perſons of the Church of England, will ſtand as a convincing Preiudice againſt him, and his charge, till he can make it as euident that the Church of Rome is guilty of Idolatry, as the miſchiefs are that haue enſued vpon it.* And I can imagin no *probable reaſon*, why he ſhould not haue endeavour'd at leaſt, either in his *General Preface*, or

in his *Defence*, to haue removed *this Preiudice*, but that he was *so farr* of Mr. *Thorndike's mind* in the matter, as to think it a *task impossible* to be performed. Otherwise surely he would not haue sate downe quietly with the *Imputation* of so *horrible a Sin*, as Mr. *Thorndike* characters *that* of *Schism* to be in the sight of *God* in his next Chapter, euen *greater than that of Heresy or Apostasy*. For *an Heretick or an Apostate, saith* he, *in the sight of God destroys only his own soul. But he that causeth diuision in the Church, either peremptorily* destroys, or *probably hinders the Salvation of all who are parties to it. So the Authors of Schism must answer for all the souls that perish by it.* Add to this, the infinite *Bloud-shed*, the barbarous *Violences*, the vncharitable *slanders*, the horrid *perjuries*, the vnchristian *practices*, the Antichristian doctrines, the *hatred* of our *Fellow christians* worse than *Iews* and *Mahumetans*, the *reviling* the *first* and *greatest* of *Patriarchs*, (at least in *Order* and *Dignity*,) as *the Man of sin*; and *railing* at *that* Church, which the Dr. himself acknowledges to be *a true Church*, *Chap. 2.*

XUM

and to hold all the Essentials of Faith, as the *Mistresse* of *Idolatry*, and the *Whore of Babylon* : besides the *other mischief.* and *Miseries*, which *this division* hath brought forth, *part of which* saith Dr. St. himself, *if our experience doth not tell vs of, yet our consciences may.* Adde I say *these things*, which lye open to the *eyes* of men, to the *hainousnesse* of *Schisme* in the sight of *God*, which, as *Dr. Hammond* tells us out of the Fathers, is as great if not greater than *Sacriledg, Parricide or Idolatry*, not *iustifyable* by any pretence whatsoeuer, *nor expiable even by Martyrdome it self*, and you will see what *reason* there was, why Dr. St. should haue endeavourd at least the *answering* Mr. *Thorndike's* argument, least he might be thought by his *silence* to stand *convicted* of the *consequence* of it, (that is, the *guilt* of *Schisme*) in his *own* Judgment.

Iren. p. 62.

Of Schis. ch. 1. Sect. 6. 7. 8.

Cathar. These are *terrible Bugbears* indeed to *frighten* vs from the *Charge* of *Idolatry*. But still our *Plea* is the same in order to the Church of *England*, With that of the *Church* of *England* to *that* of *Rome*; and whe-

ther the charge be of *Idolatry*, as we will haue it, or only of *Abuſes and Superſtitions* as Mr. *Thorndike* calls them, the caſe of both is *alike* as to the *Church* of *Rome*: for *both* doe *grant*, that *not thoſe who ſeparate, but thoſe who cauſe the ſeparation by impoſing and requiring things vnlawful, as conditions of Communion, are Schiſmaticks before God*; Only this *aduantage* they haue, who charge the *Church* of *Rome* with *Idolatry*, that it lyes open to the *Conſcience* of euery man, *if that Church be guilty of it, our ſeparation can be no Schiſm either before God or man, becauſe our Communion would be a ſin, whereas other Pleas are ſubile and Nice, tedious and obſcure*, as Dr St. ſaith.

Eun. But haue you *proued* the *Church* of *Rome* to be *guilty* of *Idolatry*, or thoſe things which the *Church* of *England* requireth of you to be *vnlawful*, as *euidently*, as the *Miſchiefs* are which haue *Enſued* vpon the *Separation*?

Cathar. And haue *you proued* the *things* which the *Church* of *England* requireth, to be *lawful*; and the *Abuſes* and *Superſtitions* of the *Church* of *Rome* as Mr. Thornd. calls them, to be *as eui-*

dently such, as the *Miſchiefs* are which haue followed frō the *impoſing* of *them?* The *conteſt* at the beſt ſtands yet *ſub Judice*, as to *both*, and for what concernsthe *Church* of *Rome*, *thoſe that Gouern that* *Ch. 2* *See* (whom Mr. *Thorndike* eſteems the *wiſeſt people vpon earth*) *and all thoſe, whom their wiſdome carries along*, deny what they require as *terms of Communion* with them, to be either *abuſes* or *Superſtitions*. And ſo T. G's. *Argument*, which you mentioned before, if it be *good* for any thing will haue *equall* force againſt the *charge* of *Superſtition*, as of *Idolatry*, viz, that *till the Accuſation be made Good, and iudged ſo by ſome more competent Judge, than your ſelues, you ſtand arraigned of the Crime of Schiſm alſo for breaking Communion with the Church of Rome.*

Eun. Forthat, *we appeal*, ſaith *Dr. St. to the doctrine and Practice of the truly Catholick Church, in the matters of difference between us and the Church of Rome.* *Anſww. to N. 0. 180.*

Cathar. Very well: But then, *you* are *bound* I hope, as well as *Dr. St.* either to *acknowledge* the *Roman* to be *that* Church, and conſequently to *ſtand* to

to *her* Judgement: or to *assign* some *other* Church *distinct* from the *Roman*, which *Christ* hath preserved free from *those doctrines* and *Practices*, which you call *Abuses and Superstitions*, unless you will be your *own Judges*. Which *way* you will take, I shall leaue to your consideration.

But for the Dr. me thinks you needed not to haue been so *seuere* vpon him, for *not Answering* Mr. *Thorndike's Arguments*; for although he thought it not *fitting* to *combate* him by *name*, whilst he was *defending* the *cause* of the *Church* of *England*, yet he hath *Sufficiently* proved his own *Charge*, both in *his* Treatise of the *Idolatry of the Church of Rome*, and in *his* late *Defence* of it against the *Cavils* of T. G. first by shewing, that the *Heathens* were not *iustly* charged with *Idolatry*, if the *Church* of *Rome* be not *guilty* of *it*; and 2dly that *all worship* of *God* by an *Image* is *expressly forbidden* vnder the notion of *Idolatry* in the 2^d^ *Commandment*. What *need* was there then of a *particular answer*?

Eun. This is a pretty kind of plausible *come off*, but will not serve the *turn*,

I know the word [*sufficiently*] confidently uttered can do *wonders*. The *Oracles* of *General Councils* are *nothing* to *it*, especially if added to a Text of *Scripture* though neuer so much *wrested*. But I am too well acquainted with it, to be *imposed* on by it. Nothing will be *sufficient* here, but what makes the *Idolatry* of the *Church* of *Rome*, as *Evident* as the *mischiefs* are, which haue ensued vpon the *Separation*; and your self I believe will grant the *first Proof* from the *practice* of the *Heathens* not to be of *that* nature, when you shall haue considered, how expresly the *Scripture* taxes the *Heathens* of *Polytheism* and for worshipping their *Idols* as *Gods*, and the *Obscurity* and *Contradiction* there is found in the manner of their *worship* even as it was explicated by the *most learned* of their *Philosophers*. I know very well that Dr St. in his *defence* strains all the *Nerves* of his *wit*, and the *Texts*, of many of *those Fathers* he cites to proue *the Heathens Supream God Jupiter*, *to be the Supream Being*, *Creator and Governour of the world*; by that means to *dragg* the worship of the *Heathens* in to a *Parald*

with *that* of the *Church* of *Rome*: but I neuer yet met with any *man* that *believed* it was or is what he would haue it to be; and I haue that esteem for the deuotion of the *Feminine Sex* that did they believe it, they would never be so Prophani, as to give the sacred *name* of *Jupiter* to their *Dogs*: But however that be (which we may haue occasion to Examin hereafter) t'is plain the Argument can signify *nothing* to the *purpose*. For if the *Heathens* gaue not the *same* worship to their *Images* and *Inferiour Deities* which the *Church* of *Rome* doth to her *Images* and *Saints*, the *Paralell* is *lost*: And if they gaue *the same* which the *Church* of *Rome* allows, the *manner* of the *Worship* which he there insists vpon (howeuer they might be *mistaken* in the *things* or *Persons*) is excused from *Idolatry* by many *Eminent diuines* of the *Church* of *England*, as you heard before, and will neuer be proued by Dr. St. to be so. All then that such an *Extrinsic Topick* can do, is that *it* may serue to *amuze* the *Ignorant* but can neuer *Satisfy* a *Judicious* Reader.

As for the 2d that *God in the second*

Commandment hath expreſsly prohibited the giuing any worship to himſelf by an Image, let vs firſt hear the *Exceptions* which T G. layes againſt it, in the 3d Chapter of his *Catholiks no Idolaters*, of which Dr St. takes not the leaſt *notice* neither in his *Defence*.

p. 33.

Cath. no Idol. p. 33.

What we are to conſider in the firſt place here, ſaith T. G. is what it is that
» Dr. St. will undertake to prove: and it
» is this; that God in the 2d Command-
» ment hath expreſsly prohibited the gi-
» ving any worship to himſelf by an Ima-
» ge. This is what vpon Second thoughts
» (for the term expreſsly was not in his
» firſt Answer) he undertakes to prove:
» And I cannot but wonder, ſaith he, to
» ſee it drop now from his Pen, who on
» the other ſide aſſerts Scripture (doubt-
» leſſe Expreſs Scripture) to be his moſt
» certain Rule of Faith, and on the other
» ſide denies, (as hath been shewed
» aboue) any thing to be an Article of
» Faith which is not acknowledged to
» be ſuch by Rome it ſelf. What may
» the meaning of this be? If it be expreſs-
» ly revealed in Scripture that God is not
» to be worshipped by an Image, it is
» an Article of Faith, If it be not acknow-

ledged to be ſuch by Rome it ſelf, it is no Article of Faith but (as he calls it) an Inferiour Truth or Pious Opinion, yet ſuch as neither himſelf, nor any man elſe according to his Principles ought to believe there is a lot of Truth in it. Here vpon he calls vpon the Dr. to ſpeak out. *Is it, or is it not an Article of Faith? If it be an Article of Faith, t'is falſe what he aſſerts ſo ſtiffly in his Rational Account p. 54. that the Church of England makes no Articles of Faith, but what are acknowledged to be ſuch by Rome it ſelf. If it be not an Article of Faith, t'is falſe what he affirms ſo poſitively here, that God hath expreſsly prohibited it in the 2d Commandment. And which ſide ſoever he takes, tis manifeſt he contradicts himſelf.* Here was Prouocation enough for Dr. St. to cleer himſelf. But T. G. proceeds.

Perhaps his meaning is, ſaith he, that what at one time is but an Inferiour Truth, muſt at another time be an Article of Faith, according as it may ſerue to the different ends and purpoſes he hath deſigned to himſelf. And here, if I miſtake not, ſaith T. G. lies the Knack, or

» (if you will giue it ſo venerable a name)
» the Myſtery of the buſineſs. When the
» Hedge of the Church of England (viz,
» Suſcription to her 39. Articles) muſt be
» broken down for the Good Brethren
» the Non-Conformiſts (pray pardon me,
» if I repeat his words) to enter in and
» ravage without ſcruple her Rights and
» Reuenues, ſo many of the ſaid Articles,
» as are not owned by Rome it ſelf, muſt
» paſs for a company of Inferiour Truths,
» or Pious Opinions, not, to be aſſented
» to, but not to be oppoſed for Unitie's
» ſake. But when the Church of Rome
» is to be charged with Idolatry (the Pre-
» tence, ſaith Mr. Thorndike, with
» which Ignorant Preachers driue their
» factions) then they are no more Infe-
» riour Truths, but Articles of Faith ex-
» preſsly reuealed in Holy Scripture. Now
» would an Impartial Reader (to uſe
» Dr. Taylor's expreſſion vpon another
» occaſion) ſay vpon his Conſcience,
» that this was not kindly done, to make
» vſe of the Authority of the Church of
» Rome, to vnhallow ſo many of the
» 39. Articles, as are not owned by her,
» and caſt them down into the claſs of
» Inferiour Truths, to ſtich vp the Rent

made by the Non-Conformists from „
the Church of England: And then to „
consecrate them again so easily by ver- „
tue of that one Definitiue word [expres- „
ly] into diuine Reuelations, against the „
Church of Rome, to make the Breach „
of the Church of England from her, „
yet wider. But what cannot an Ireni- „
cal complyance with one Party; and a „
Polemical Animosity, or (as Mr. „
Thorndike calls it Faction) against „
another doe? when the same Proposi- „
tion, as it respects the former shall be „
ranked only amongst Inferiour Truths, „
which none are obliged to assent to; „
and as it may serue to oppugn the lat- „
ter, shal be raised to an Article of Faith, „
which all are bound to believe. Here „
then saith he, lyes the Mystery, that „
the same Propoſition, viz *that God is* „
not to be worshiped by an Image, taken „
Irenically and in its Pacifick temper, is „
but an Inferiour Truth, because not „
owned to be an Article of Faith by „
the Church of Rome: but taken Pole- „
mically, and in its warlike Humour, „
it must be an Article of Faith, because „
expresly (as Dr. St. saith) revealed „
in scripture. Thus T. G. „

Ca'har. This is meer *Scholaſtick Fooling* indeed, and would you haue Dr. St. trouble himſelf with ſuch *ſtuff* as this? What he would haue ſaid, *could* he haue ſpoken to it, (for I confeſs the *Point* is *nice* in his circumſtances) I ſhal not vndertake to *Divine.* T'is *wiſdome* you know to be *in vtrumq; paratus* yet I was alwaies of *Opinion*, that if he would haue *no Articles* of *Faith*, *but what are acknowledged for ſuch by Rome it ſelf*, he ought to haue excepted *this* at leaſt of *not giving any worſhip to God himſelf by an Image*, this ſeeming to me ſo plainly and *expreſsly* deliuered in the 2d *Commandment*, That if *Scripture* be the *Rule* of our *Faith*, I ſee not how *any point* can be an *Article* of *Faith*, if *this* be *not.*

Eun. I ſee you are no Friend to *School-diſtinctions*; (though Dr. St. himſelf as you know is ſometimes fain to make vſe of *them*) and much leſſe to the way of making men *contradict* themſelues. But then it is neceſſary, eſpecially for *Controvertiſts* to prouide they do *not* do it. *T'is neceſſary as Mr. Thorndike* ſayes, *that they vnderſtand themſelues, whether they admit the conſequence*

sequence of their own supposition, or not: which I think Dr. St. did not consider, when he advanced this *Proposition*, that *God in the 2d Commandment hath expresly prohibited the giuing any worship to himself by an Image*. For (as T. G. discourses vpon it) It were well he would tell vs first, what he vnderstands by the term [Expresly.] For if he call that (for example) an expres Text, which of it self is absolutely cleer and manifest, and therefore as St. Austin saith, *Non eget Interprete*, needs no Interpreter, Mr. Thorndike (and those other learned men of the Church of England who see no better than He) haue reason to lament the loss of their Eye-sight. But if he mean no more, but that it is cleer and manifest to himself, they may hope they see as well as their Neighbours, though they see the quite contrary; vnless they will suffer themselues to be wrought vpon by his stout asserting it to be cleer and manifest as the Travellers were by Polus, (in Erasmus his Exorcismus) when pretending that he saw a huge Dragon with fiery horns in the sky, by auouching it strongly, and pointing expresly to the Place,

Catho. no. Idol. p. 36.

"*Li de Vsit. Eccl. c. 19.*

» he forced them (out of shame not to
» see so conspicuous a thing) to confess,
» that they saw it also. Now that it is not
» absolutely cleer and manifest of it self,
» the pains and ways he takes to find it
» out sufficiently evince , And whether
» it be cleer and manifest euen to himself,
» we haue cause to doubt ; because the
» Proposition in debate, viz, That God
» hath prohibited the giving any wor-
» ship to himself by an Image, not being
» acknowledged by the Church of Rome
» for an Article of Faith , the Church of
» England , according to himself, obliges
» no man to assent to it , but only not to
» oppose it ; and yet on the other side
» Euery man is bound to assent to that,
» which he sees to be clear and manifest.
« Such frequent self-contradictions , saith
» T. G. are the natural consequences of
» a discourse not grounded vpon Truth.

Cathar. This is *iust* what Dr. St. saith of I. W: that *he* makes him *pile Contradictions vpon Contradictions , as Children do cards one vpon another, and then he comes and cunningly steals away one of the Supporters , and down all the rest fall in great disorder and confusion.*

Def. p. 785.

Eun: This is *pleaſantly* enough *ſaid*, and may ſerue to entertain *drollish* wit, though I underſtand not well what he means by his Aduerſary's *Stealing away one of the Supporters*. If this *piling* of *contradictions* be like that of *Cards*, me thinks it ſhould be Dr. St's. part to *ſteal away* one of the *ſupporters*, that the *Falrick* may *fall* to the ground; for whilſt *both ſtand* the *Contradiction* will remain. But this cannot be done without renouncing *one* of his *Principles*, viz, either that *he makes no Articles of Faith but what are acknowledged for ſuch by Rome it ſelf*, or that *it is expreſsly revealed in Scripture* (the Rule of Faith) *that God is not to be worshipped by an Image*. Otherwiſe it is not the *puff* of a *Ieſt* that will *blow* down the *building*. And therefore T. G. adds, that *although the Reader may think*, (as I perceiue you do) *he takes a delight to diſcover ſuch frequent Contradictions in his Adverſary, yet I can aſſure him*, ſaith he, *'tis a much greater Grief to me, to ſee ſo ſubtil a wit ſo often intangled in them. The fault is in the Cauſe*, (I ſuppoſe he means the charge of Idolatry) *which cannot be managed without falling*

into them. But as S. Austin saith. Quis coegit eos malam causam habere; *Who compelled him and his Partizans to engage themselues in a bad Cause? Nothing of Faith, if that be true, which he tells us in his Rational* Account. *Nothing of Reason, as will be shewed in the examination of his Proofs.* Now if after all this, you still persist in the same mind you were of, that the *prohibition of giving any worship to God himself by an Image, is so cleerly and expresly delivered in the* 2d *Commandment, that if Scripture be the Rule of Faith, nothing can be an Article of Faith, if that be not*; let me desire you to consider farther what T. G. hath reply'd in *particular*, to Dr. Sts first way of *finding* out the *Sense* of the *Law*, viz, *from the Terms in which the Law is expressed.*

Gather. no Idol. p. 31. Exod 20. 4. *Thou shalt not make vnto thee any graven Image, or any likeness of any thing &c. Thou shalt not bow down thy self to them, nor serve them.*

„ These are the Terms, in which the Law
„ is expressed according to the Transla-
„ tion used in the Church of England:
„ and where, I pray, saith T. G. is it ex-
„ pressed here that we may not giue any

worship to God himself by an Image? »
The first part touches not the worship »
of Images, or of God himself by them, »
but only the making them, and giues »
matter to Diuines to dispute, whether it »
be forbidden by this Commandment »
to make any Image or any likeneſs at »
all; a thing in which Proteſtants are con- »
cerned, as well as Catholicks. The ſecond »
forbids indeed in expreſs terms to bow »
our ſelues down to the Images them- »
ſelues (as the Heathens did) but ſpeaks »
not one word of the lawfulneſs or vn- »
lawfulneſs of worshipping God himſelf »
by them. So that if to treat a matter »
expreſsly, be not the ſame in other »
words, as not to ſpeak of it at all, it is »
manifeſt, that to worship God himſelf »
before or by an Image, is not expreſsly »
prohibited by this Commandment »
This T. G. deſires his Proteſtant Rea- »
der (he should haue ſaid Puritan) to »
conſider well, and not ſuffer himſelf to »
be deluded wish the ſound of words. »
Is it all one, ſaith he to bow our ſelues »
down to the Images themſelues without »
any Relation to God, and to worship »
God himſelf by bowing before an Ima- »
ge? The difference is too palpable not »

to be seen by any one who hath not the natural Conceptions of his mind corrupted by an ouer eager desire to pursue
» at any rate so vniust and vncharitable a
» charge, as that of Idolatry. The Iews
» we know gaue worship to God by
» bowing down before the Ark and the
» Cherubins, and yet they did not wor-
» ship them instead of God: And if Dr. St.
» will needs contend, that this was a par-
» ticular dispensation to the Iews, that
» they might lawfully bow down to or
» before the Ark and Cherubins to give
» worship to God, he must acknowledg
» the Precept (if it were so) as to that
» part, viz, of not worshipping God by
» bowing before an Image, not to haue
» been Natural, for then God had dis-
» pensed with them to commit Real Ido-
» latry; but Ceremonial only, and so not
» to oblige Christians, vnless he wil en-
» gage them also in the obseruance of all
» the Ceremonial part of the Law of
» Moses. Taking then the Terms of the
» Law, and that in the most favourable
» Translation to the Dr's Cause, tis
» euident that to worship God himself by
» an Image is not expressly prohibited in
» it. And the *Euidence* of *this* is so *great*,

that although Dr. St. in his late *Defence* ſpend aboue a 100. Pages about the *Senſe of the Second Commandment*, yet he neither endeavours to *remove* the *Contradictions*, nor anſwer the *Arguments* of T. G. His whole buſineſs there is to *Criticize* vpon the *Exceptions* which T. G. had made to the *ſeveral Methods he propoſed for the finding out, the Senſe of the Law*. A very pleaſant *diverſion* if you conſider it well. *I propoſed*, ſaith he, *ſeveral Methods for the finding out the Senſe of the Law. The firſt whereof was from the General terms in which the Law was Expreſſed* (viz the terms, *Image*, and *Similitude*.) And that we might be ſure to take notice of it he gives us the ſame *Item* when he comes to the *Second*: The ſecond way, ſaith he, I propoſed to *find out* the ſenſe of the Commandment was from the *Reaſon* of it. And ſo when he comes to the *Third*. The laſt way, I propoſed to *find out* the ſenſe of the Law, was from the *Judgment* of the *Law-giver* in the Caſe of the *Golden Calf*. And who can chuſe but wonder to ſee ſo many *ways* and *Methods* purſued, ſo much *pains* and *labour* ſpent

P. 7191

P. 7390

P. 7474

(not to say *loſt*) to *ſeek* out what was *Expreſs* in the Text and plain to be ſeen without more ado? What need ſuch *beating* the *Hedges* and *Bushes* to find out the *Game*, if it show it ſelf *fairly* in the Open Feild? Hunters ſometimes will paſs by a *Hare* in the *Form*, and let the *Hounds* looſe to find her out by the *Sent*. But theſe are ſuch as *hunt* more for their *Pleaſure* and *Exerciſe*, than for the *Game*.

Cathar. And why may not Dr. St. *courſe* it ſomerimes in like manner in *Controverſy*. T'is *mean* and *clownish* to *knock* the *Point* preſently on the head, where as she purſuing new *ways* and *Methods* to *find* it out affords great matter both of *pleaſure* and *Exerciſe* of Wit.

Eunom. But whilſt the Dr. *hunts* thus for his *pleaſure*, may he not be in danger *to loſe* the *Prey?*

Cathar. No fear at all of that. The very *Charge* of *Idolatry* ſecures it to him:

Spec. p. 44. For (as my good Friend, *Patronus bonæ Fidei obſerves*) *The Puritans* (who ground themſelues upon *that charge*) *do not ſo eaſily become Papiſts, as thoſe of the Church of England who take*

otherways; whose consanguinity (as he calls it) *in life and discipline with the Papists carries them ouer to them upon the least impulse, as might be instanc'd in many, whose names you may find in a litle Book called* Legenda lignea: *Whereas on the contrary, the life, the doctrine and discipline of the Puritans, as approaching nearer to the Apostolick, make them more averse and incensed against the Papists, and very hardly or never to pass over to them.*

Eun. This is a notable *Observation* indeed, and perhaps may *hold* better, for the *Fanaticks* or the *Turks*, than the *Puritans*. But *Mr. Thorndike* had a different esteem of the matter, when weighing in his *Just Weight* ch. 2. *what we get by the Charge of Idolatry and Antichrist*, he appeals to the Judgment of men of discretion, *Whether This be not the reason of that which wise men haue obserued, that the passage from the one Extream to the other is more easy and frequent among us, than from the mean to the Extream. For when a Novice*, saith he, *grounded upon this Supposition is forced from his Ground upon Remonstrance of such Reasons* (as may

be and are produced againſt it) *how ready is He to fall into the Snare of the Miſſionaries.* And there upon it is, that he adviſes *them not to lead the People by the Noſe; to believe, they can prove their Suppoſition, when They cannot; and then expect that it be maintained by Thoſe that own the Church of Rome for a true Church, and therefore muſt contradict themſelues, if they maintain it.* What Dr. St. ſhould haue done was to *remove* the *Contradictions*, objected to him, and anſwer the *Arguments* of T. G. and not go a *courſing* for his *pleaſure* with new *ways* and *Methods* to *find out* that which himſelf affirms to be ſo cleerly *Expreſſed* in the *Second* Commandment, *that it cannot enter into his mind, how God ſhould haue forbidden it by more expreſs and Emphatical words, than he hath done.* But of *this* I may haue occaſion to ſpeak again here after. Let us now, if you pleaſe, *adjourn* till another time.

Rom. Idol p. 58.

THE FIFTH DIALOGVE.

THE ARGUMENT.

The Charge of Idolatry not maintainable without ſubverting all lawful Eccleſiaſtical Authority in the Church of England. Dr. St's. Doctrine in his Anſwer to N. O. concerning the Power and Authority of the Church: He is left at liberty to chuſe whether he will haue it be a Retractation or Contradiction of what he aſſerted in his Irenicum, ſet down in the 3d Dialogue. His miſtake of the Validity of Ordination for the lawful Authority to Exerciſe the Power conferred by it, ſhown to be Inexcuſable. A Recapitulation of what hath been diſcourſed in this, and the fore-going Dialogues.

CATHARINVS, EVNOMIVS

EVn: Hitherto *Catharinus* I haue entertained you with ſome remar-

kable *Omissions* of Dr. St. to the *Exceptions* made by T. G. to his *Charge* of *Idolatry*; and although perhaps you will not esteem *them* so much as *Venial sins*, and much less his *Silence* to be a *yeilding* of the *Cause*, yet some of them are of that *Importance* that the whole *weight* of the matter in debate lies vpon them. As for the faults of *Commission*, where He thought fit to break *Silence*, and speak to his Adversary's *Arguments*, some of them also may chance to come in our way before we end: At present *I shall* only giue you *one* for a *Tast*, by which you may iudge, not only what *Candour*, and *Sincerity*, but what *skill* also in *Church-affairs* you are to expect in the rest. It is that of the Subversion of *Ecclesiasticall Authority* in the *Church* of *England*, which T. G. contends to follow from the *Charge* of *Idolatry* against the *Church* of *Rome*.

Cathar. This is what I haue long *expected*, and would gladly *see*. And surely, it must be no less, than another *Thunder-shower with a terrible crack*, it has made such a *rumbling* in the ayr before it breaks.

P. 173.

Eun: Whatever it be, you shall

haue it in T. Gs. own words at the end of his *Preface* to *Catholicks no Idolaters*, where hauing laid down *this* for his *Position*, that *the Charge of Idolatry subverts the very foundation of Ecclesiastical Authority in the Church of England*, he proues it with this reason; because *it being a receiued Maxime, and not deniable by any one of Common Sense, that no man can giue to another, that which he hath not himself, it lies open to the Conscience of Euery man, that if the Church of Rome be guilty of Heresy, much more if guilty of Idolatry, it falls vnder the Apostle's Excommunication* (*Gal* 1. 8.) *and so remains deprived of the lawful Authority to vse and exercise the power of Orders, and consequently the Authority of Gouerning, Preaching, and Administring Sacraments, which those of the Church of England challenge to themselues, as deriued from the Church of Rome, can be no true and lawful Jurisdiction, but vsurped and Antichristian.* This you see bids very fair towards the subversion of all *lawful Authority* in the *Church* of *England* if the *Church* of *Rome* were guilty of *Idolatry*, when the *Schism* began;

becauſe *Excommunicated* Perſons, ſuch as *Idolaters* are, being depriued of *lawfull Authority* themſelues, can giue none to others; and if thoſe others take *any* vpon them, it muſt be *vſurped* and *vnlawful*; no man can *giue* to another what he hath *not* in himſelf: and vpon this Principle it is, that the *Earl* of *Clarendon* in his late *Excellent Survey of Leviathan* p. 40. 41. affirms, that *this ſole Propoſition, that men cannot diſpoſe of their own liues, hath been alwaies held as a manifeſt and vndeniable Argument, that Soveraigns neuer had, nor can haue their power from the People; becauſe it is without doubt, that no man is* Dominus vitæ ſuæ *and therefore cannot giue that to another, which he hath not in himſelf.* And the Maxime holds no leſs in *Spiritual* than in *Temporal* Juriſdiction.

But then again, if we conſider the *time*, when Dr. St. aduanced this *charge* of *Idolatry* againſt the *Church* of *Rome*, that is, after he had by a *new* Impreſſion *tendred his Irenicum in the year 1662. to Conſideration.* Viz, after that *Epiſcopacy* was reſetled in the *Church* of *England*, we ſhall find the

Argument preſs much *more home*, For, maintaining as he does in that Book, *that no particular Form of Church-Government is* de Jure Divino *but mutable as the ſecular Magiſtrate, with the aduice of learned and Experienced Perſons, ſhall ſee convenient for State and Church; and particularly that the main ground for ſetling Epiſcopal Government in this Nation, was not any pretence of Divine Right, but Conveniency to the State and Condition of the Church at the time of it's Reformation, citing for it the Teſtimony of Arch Bp. Cranmer and others; This* ſaith T. G. *ſeems but too apparently to be a clinching of the Nail which he had driuen before to the head. For, if the Form of Church Government be mutable, as the Secular Power wel-adviſed ſhall ſee Reaſon, what greater Reaſon can there be, ſaith he, for the actual changing of Epiſcopacy, than the Nullity of it's Juriſdiction?* And therefore *wonders, how the Governours of the Church of England could ſee their Authority ſo cloſely attacqued (at leaſt ſo manifeſtly betrayed) by their pretended Champion, and not vindicate themſelues and their Juriſdiction from*

the foul ſtain of Antichriſtian, which neceſſarily follows, if the Church of Rome, as he pretends, be guilty of Idolatry, and they derive together with their Conſecration, their Epiſcopal Juriſdiction from it.

Cathar. This is a *terrible Blow* indeed, as Dr. St. calls it in his *General Preface*, and had he not ſufficiently *warded it off*, others perhaps might haue been *ſollicitous* for it. But I ſtill hope with my good Friend *Patronus bonæ fidei*, that *what things were formerly ſaid by Dr. St. in a lower fortune and ſtation, concerning the Irregular and Exorbitant Power of the English Epiſcopacy (of which there is no appearance in the Primitive Church) viz that one Paſtor ſhould be over many fix'd Congregations of Chriſtians; as alſo concerning the diſcipline of the Presbyterians, more neerly approaching to the Apoſtolick Form, than that of the Hierarchicks, and more fitly agreeing with the light of Nature*; my hope is, I ſay, that *now he ſits high among the Hierarchicks, and is in the way to riſe higher, He will not retract and cõdemn his former Aſſertions, making his Opinion turn and vere about with the wind of honour.*

Defenſ. verit. p. 13.

Eun.

Eun: I told you before, I shall not concern my self in the *Motives* of the change. They better become (or if you will, come better from) your Friend, the *Patron bonæ fidei*, as you call him. But how farr the Dr. St. hath proceeded in *changing* his Opinions (if they were as you say) your self will iudge when you shall hear what he saith in the *first Part of his Answer* to N. O.

First concerning *Episcopacy*. *We defend*, saith he, *the Government of the Church by Bishops to be the most ancient and Apostolical Government, and that no Person can haue sufficient reason to cast that off, which hath been so vniuersally received in all Ages since the Apostle's times.* p. 181.

2dly *Concerning the Authority* of making *Rules* and *Canons* about matters of *Order* and Decency in the *Church*, I *freely grant* saith he, *not only that such an Authority is in its self reasonable and Iust; but that in such matters required by a lawful Authority*, (*such as that of our Church is*) *there is an advantage on the side of Authority, against a Scrupulous Conscience, which ought to ouerrule the practice of such who are the* p. 268.

members of that Church.

p. 163. 3dly Concerning the *Authority* of propoſing even *matters of Faith, and directing men in Religion, which* he ſaith, *is the proper Authority of Teachers, and Guides, and Inſtructers of others*, he affirmeth that *thoſe who are duely appointed for this work, and ordained by thoſe whoſe Office is to ordain*, viz, *the Biſhops, have an Authority to declare what the mind and will of God is, contained in Scripture in order to the Salvation and edification of the ſouls of Men.*

4thly Concerning *Subſcription*, he acknowledgeth that *the Synod or Convocation in the preſent circumſtances hath the power and Authority within it ſelf to declare what Errours and Abuſes are crept into Religion and Doctrine, Which they iudg fit to reform, and to require a conſent to ſuch Propoſitions as are agreed upon for that end, of thoſe who are to enioy the Publick Offices of teaching and inſtructing others*', *and not to allow any Perſons to preach and Officiate in the Church, in a way contrary to the deſign of ſuch a Reformation* Which I take to be the *ſame* with what

the Author of the *Reply* to the *Naked Truth*, pag. 6. asserteth, when he saith, *that the Church is so iust to her self as to exact for the security of her own peace, that all whom she trusts with teaching others, or whom she recommends to the world with University-Degrees shall subscribe to the 39. Articles, as their own Opinions, and what they believe as convinced in their own Judgments that they are true, what do you think of this, Catharinus?* Is this a *Retractation* or no?

Cathar. I think there is a great deal of *difference* between changing *Opinion*, and changing the *Person*. That Dr. St. speaks there in the *Person* of the *Church* of *England* to stop the mouth of an *Importune* Adversary (N. O.) who would haue *no Authority left in the Guides of the Church, if Infallible direction were taken from them*; is manifest from the *Design* of his discourse. But nothing I suppose of a *Retractation*, because I neuer heard he made any *Recantation-Sermon*, for what he had writen either in his *Irenicum*, or *Rational Account*, or other *writings*; or any other publick *Profession* of *retracting* or *condemning* his former *Opinions*. Nay do you not

ſee, how *careful* he is not to be thought to *retract*, when hauing giuen *Authority to the Synod to require a* conſent *to the Propoſitions agreed vpon*; he preſently takes it away again, by telling vs, that *Perſons may not be allowed to preach and Officiate in the Church in a way contrary to the deſign of the Reformation?* Which I take to be the *ſame* with his *former* Aſſertion, that *what is required of them is no more than not to oppoſe or contradict them.*

Eun: This kind of dealing is I aſſure you an Argument to me, that the *Reaſons* for theſe *new* Aſſertions did not appear *Satisfactory* to him, becauſe I believe what he *proteſts* concerning his *charge* of *Idolatry* at the end of his *defence* p. 877. viz that *if the ſubtilties of T. G. could haue ſatisfied him or any other Argument he had met with, he would as freely haue retracted his Charge of Idolatry, as he euer* made it; to be altogether as true here; that is, *had he met with any Arguments which could haue ſatisfied him of the Erroneouſneſs of his former Opinions, he would as willingly haue retracted them as euer he advanc'd them.* The *diſtinction* you

make of changing the *Perſon*, not the *Opinion*, is very *ſubtil*: But he hath *Cunning Sophiſters*, as you know, *to deal with*; and if it paſs not for a *Retractation*, they will be ready to ſay that he *contradicts* himſelf; and ſo raiſe vp a new *Pile* or rather *Pyramid* of *Contradictions*, for him to pluck down.

Cathar. I hate this piling of *Contradictions* with all my heart. And therefore pray return to the *Terrible Blow*.

Eun. I ſhall. And it is if you remember that *if the firſt Ordainers of the English Biſhops were Idolaters, they were depriued themſelues of lawful Authority to ordain, becauſe they fell vnder the Apoſtles Excommunication, and ſo could giue none to thoſe whom they ordained? What can be ſaid to this?*

Cathar: This it is, as Dr. St. Saith, to *charge home, and ſo Farewel to the Church of England, if the Church of Rome were not more kind in this caſe, than T. G. is. Hitherto we haue ſeen his Skil in the affairs of our Church, and now* ſaith the Dr. *we ſhall ſee iuſt as much in the Doctrine of his own. For doth not the Council of Trent make Orders a Sacrament? And one of thoſe*

which do imprint an indelible Character ? And doth *not that Council pronounce an Anathema against those that denied the validity of the Sacrament administred by one in mortal sin, in case he observes the Essentials of it. How then can T. G. escape Excommunication from his own* Church, *who denies the validity of the Sacrament of Orders, in case of the sin of the Giuers of it ?* And then after this he proceeds to *proue* his Assertion for no less than 16. Pages together, viz. that *a Bishop who is in mortal sin, or an Heretick, may validly ordain a Bishop or a Priest*, with a cloud of *Testimonies* both out of the *Ancient* Fathers, and *Modern* Doctors of the *Church* of *Rome* as *Vasquez*, *Estius*, *Aquinas*, *Bonaventure*, &c. as also from the *Practice* both of the *Ancient* and *Modern Church*, in this case. Doe you not think the *Blow* sufficiently *warded off*, and deseruedly *retorted* vpon the head of T. G.

Eun: This indeed may be called an *Answer* with a *Witness*. But what if the *Witnesses* speak *not at all* to the case in debate, or if they do, it is for T. G. Does T. G. any where *denie* the *Validity* of the *Sa-*

trament of *Orders* in case of the *Sin* of the *Giuers* of it? Consider the *argument* again, and you will not find so much as one word that sounds to that purpose. The Consequence T. G. draws from Dr. Sts *charge* of *Idolatry*, was not to disprove the *Validity* of the *Ordination* of the *Protestant Bishops*, but the *lawfulness* of their *Authority to vse and exercise the power of Orders*, which he did by showing, that the *Ordainers* hauing *lost* the *lawful* exercise of their Orders by falling into *Idolatry*, (though we should suppose the *Protestant Bishops*, to haue been *validly* ordained by them,) yet could *they* not *receiue* any *lawful* Authority or *Iurisdiction* from them; it being an vndeniable *Maxime*, that *nothing can giue to another what it hath not it self*. Now that a Man may truely and *validly* haue the *Order* of a *Bishop* or *Priest* confer'd vpon him, and yet not haue *lawful* Authority to exercise what belongs to *that* Order, is out of question, from the acknowledgment and practice both of the *Church* of Rome and *that* of *England*, which for certain crimes, as *Heresy*, *Murder*, *Apostasy*, and the like, *suspend* and

Excommunicate the Offenders. And it is agreed on both ſides, that Perſons ſo *ſuſpended* and *Excommunicated* cannot *lawfully* exerciſe the Functions belonging to thoſe Orders. Hence it is, that a *Miniſter Silenc'd* and *Suſpended* by his Bishop, though he retain the *character* of his Order, that is, remain ſtill a *Miniſter*, yet cannot he *lawfully* preach or adminiſter the *Sacraments*. The ſame is alſo of a *Bishop*, if he be *ſuſpended* or *Excommunicated* for *hereſy* or the like, he cannot *lawfully* confer Orders, nor giue *that Juriſdiction* to another, of which he is *deprived* himſelf. And in caſe he ſhould, the Perſon ſo *receiving* them, would in that caſe remain *ſuſpended* as well as the *Bishop*. This then is what T. G. inſiſted vpon, that the *Firſt Ordainers*, who were of the *Roman* Communion, hauing *loſt* by the ſuppoſed crime of *Idolatry*, the *lawful* Authority of exerciſing their Orders, could not *communicate* any *ſuch* Authority to thoſe whom they *Ordained*, and conſequently there could be no *ſuch Authority* in the *Proteſtant* Bishops, if the *Church* of *Rome*, as Dr. St. pretends, were guilty

guilty of *Idolatry*, and *they derive together with their Consecration their Episcopal Jurisdiction from it.*

Cathar. I confeſs, you haue giuen me a new *proſpect* of T. G's. drift and *meaning* in this *Argument*, which I neuer diſcern'd till *now*, nor do I beleiue Dr. St. took it *ſo*. Otherwiſe, (I haue that eſteem for his *Sincerity*) he would not haue ſpent ſo much *pains*, and ſo many *Pages* to proue what was quite *beſide* the intent of his Adverſary, and neuer denied by him, viz that the *Sacrament of Orders is validly conferred, though the Perſon conferring chance to be in mortal ſin, or Excommunicated.*

Eun. Be it as you beleiue; yet Dr. St I think had little reaſon to *charge* T. G. with *Ignorance in Church-affairs*, when himſelf *miſtook* ſo groſsly in *them*, as to vnderſtand his Adverſary to ſpeak of the *Invalidity of Orders* in caſe of the *ſin* of the Giuers, when his whole diſcourſe tended only to show the *want* of due *Authority* to *exerciſe* them, in caſe the *Ordainers* had *none* to giue t em. But I fear there is but too much reaſon to beleiue that Dr St. *vnderſtood* all this well enough: and my Grounds

are these. 1st because there is nothing more *visible* (nor more *complain'd* of by those of *your* Party) in the practice of the *Church* of *England*, than the *Silencing* and *suspending* factious *Preachers* from the Office of *Preaching*: and Dr. St. himself supposes it *just* and *lawfull*, when he saith as you heard before, that *Persons are not to be allowed to preach and Officiate in the Church, in a way contrary to the design of the Reformation.* They must then be *Silenced* and *Suspended* from the *Exercise* of their *Function*; but are not thereby *deprived* of the *Order* of their *Ministery*, as might be instanced in many cases both *Ancient* and *Modern*, wel known to Dr. St. in which the *Persons* were *Restored* to the *exercise* of their Order, (whether *Episcopal* or *Ministerial*) not by a *new Ordination*, but by taking off the *Suspension* 2dly. Because himself could *not* but take *notice* of the *Distinction* between *Ordinatio* and *Jurisdiction*, laid down by some of the *Roman* Doctors *cited* by himself, as *Ecclius* and *Bonaventure*. The former of which, saith he, affirmeth, that *no Crime or Censure how heavy soever, can hinder*

General mistake,

the validity of Ordination by a Bishop, although it be of those who are not Subiect to his Iurisdiction, in case he observe the Essentials of the Sacrament; and that we might not doubt but he took good *notice* of what he said, he puts in a *distinct* character, that it was *for this reason. Because Ordination* saith Estius *belongs to the Power of Order, which being once received can neuer be lost; but those things which belong to Iurisdiction, as Absolution and Excommunication, haue no Effect where that Iurisdiction is taken away.* And the latter viz, *Bonaventure* saith, that *in the matter of Ordination, the Power of Orders can no more be taken way, than the Character it self; but whatsoeuer is founded vpon Iurisdiction, as the Power of Excommunication and Absolution, may be taken away.* Do you still *believe*, that Dr St. had not *ground* enough to make him consider, whether his Aduersary spoke of *Ordination* or *Iurisdiction*? That which follows will put the matter quite out of doubt; Because 3.dly T. G. expressly *declares* himself all along to speak, of the *lawfull Authority to vse and exercise the Power of*

Orders, and in his laſt words cleerly diſtinguiſhes *Juriſdiction* from *Conſecration* when he ſaith. *If the Biſhops together with their Conſecration, deriue their Epiſcopal Juriſdiction from the Church of Rome.* By which it is plain to any one of Common ſenſe, that *his Intention* in that place, was not to attacque the *Conſecration* of the *Engliſh Biſhops*, but rather ſuppoſing *that* in the preſent caſe, (as not to his purpoſe,) to ſhew from Dr. Sts. *charge* of *Idolatry* vpon their *firſt Ordainers*, their *want* of *lawful Juriſdiction.* What then can be ſaid here, but that Dr. St. could not but *ſee* the meaning and force of T. Gs. Argument; but not being able to *ward off the blow*, reſolued to caſt a *blind* before his Readers *eyes*, by impugning T. G as *if he had denied the validity of Ordination in caſe of he ſin of the Giuers of it*, And to make the *miſt* the darker he heaps a whole *Shower* of *reproaches* upon him, as the veryeſt *Ignoramus*, that euer ſet pen to paper. *Hitherto*, ſaith he, *we haue ſeen his skill in the affairs of our Church, and now wee ſhal ſee iuſt as much in the doctrine of his own. How can he eſcape Excommunication from his own Church, who denies the validity*

of the Sacrament of Orders in case of the sin of the Giuers of it? Methinks if he had forgotten the doctrine of the Council of Trent, he might haue looked into some one or other of their own Authors, to haue informed himself better of their doctrine in this matter. By this we may iudge of the learning and skill of T. G. in the doctrine of his own Church. But if he would not look into the Controuersial writers of their Church, yet if he had but searched into the practice of the Church, either in Ancient or Modern times, he would haue been Ashamed to haue made vse of such an Argument to ouerthrow all Ecclesiastical Authority among vs. What do you think of this, Catharinus? do you not beleiue the Dr. was put hard to it to keep his *Countenance* for 16. Pages together; but that he must *laugh* at least through his fingers to see what a *fourb* he had put vpon his Readers. First by *imposing* falsly vpon T. G. that he denied the *validity* of *Ordination* in case of the *sin* of the Giuers of it, and then treating him like a *Dolt*, and most *triumphantly* telling him, he might haue been *Ashamed to make vse of such an Argument?*

Is *this* it he means, when he ſo piously proteſts, that *he loues not to repreſent others worſe than they are*? He may, if he can, *Sit down with that contentment* which he propoſes to himſelf as his laſt reſort, *that he hath defended a Righteous cauſe, and with an honeſt mind.* But if he can do it upon no better an account, himſelf is like to reap but litle comfort from it; and the *Church* of *England* will I fear ſoon haue cauſe enough to be *aſhamed* of ſuch a *Champion.* For my part, I ſhall neuer *iudge* worſe hereafter of *any* Aduerſary, for being *reproached* by Dr. St. but *ſuſpect* his own *want* of *Ingenuity*, or of an *Anſwer*, *rather* than his Aduerſary's *deficiency* either in *Wit* or *Learning.* And to tell you my *Apprehenſions*, I begin already to *queſtion*, whether T. G. euer aſſerted, the *Heathens* to be *Idolaters* only for giuing *diuine honour* to the *Diuel*: and much leſs whether the *Apoſtles* and *Fathers* euer *preached* to the world, that the *Heathen's Iupiter* was the *only true God.* The noble *Panegyrick* he makes of that *King of Gods and Men* in the firſt Chapter of his *Defence*, out of the *Poets*, *Orators*, *Philoſophers* and *Fathers*, hath

Ep. Dedic. to his Defence.

but litle *Influence* vpon me *now* (though before it had a *great* deal) to make me alter my *Creed*, and say, *I believe in one God Jupiter, the Father Almighty, maker of Heauen and Earth*, &c,

Cathar. You are too seuere *Eunomius*, in your *censure*; for although Dr. St. could not be *ignorant*, that a man may haue the *Power* of *Orders* and yet *not* haue *lawful* Authority to vse them, yet it being the *Common* Objection of those of the *Church* of *Rome*, that the *Bishops* of *England* neuer had any *valid* Ordination, he might not reflect vpon the *Nicety* of the *distinction*, but *suppose* his Aduersary proceeded in the *same* strain with his fellows.

Eun: An *excellent* defence indeed for a *writer* of *Controuersy*. But what if Dr. St haue been publickly *reproued* for this *mistake*, (as you wil haue it;) as he is by E. W. (*Mr Edward Worsley*) in his Treatise *of the Infallibility of the Roman-Catholick Church*, printed at *Antwerp* 1674. and yet after that, shall take *no notice* of it, but go on, as he does in his late *Defence*, to confirm his *former* Answer with *new Proofs* and *Testimonies*, that *Bishops ordain'd by*

Idolaters, were esteemed validly ordained; and not speak one word in Answer to what was objected by T. G. viz that *the English Bishps must want lawful Authority to exercise the Power of Orders, if their first Ordainers were Idolaters?*

Cathar. To this I know not well *what* can be replied; vnless perhaps it may be said, that the *Book* you speak of neuer came to Dr. Still's *knowledg*. You know how *difficult* a thing it is to *import* Books, especially of *that nature* printed beyond sea, into *England*, and how much more *Dangerous* to *disperse* them.

Eun. Howeuer, it cannot be doubted, but *one* of them came to Dr. St's. hands, before he published his late *defence*, for p. 785. he cites the *said Treatise*, setting down the very *year* when it was printed and calls the *Author*, in his *Encomiastick* way of speaking, *That mighty man at Ecclesiastical Fencing E. W.*

Cathar. I remember now who you mean, *The renowned Champion*, as the Dr. goes on, *of our Lady of Loreto, and the miraculous Translation of her Chappel*; *of whom*, he saith, *he must*

haue litle care of himſelf, if he euer more come near the Clutches of ſuch a Giant, who ſeems to write with a Beetle inſtead of a Pen; and therefore reſolues to let him lye quietly in his ſhades, and ſnore on to dooms-day for him, vnleſs he ſee further reaſon of diſturbing his repoſe, than at preſent he does.

Eun: This is indeed the *Character*, which Dr. St. is pleas'd to giue of that *Perſon*, whom I haue heard much eſteem'd for his *Learning*. And although he meant it for an *Irony*, yet it expreſſes wel the *nature* of the *Blows*, which E. W. giues; and the Dr's *Reſolution* thereupon, *never more to diſturb his repoſe*: there being as litle *fencing* I ſuppoſe againſt a *Beetle*, as a *Flail*. And I pray ſee how cloſe the Dr. has ſtuck to *this Reſolution*, in the paſſage we are now vpon concerning T. G.

I cannot but reflect, ſaith E. W. (p. 87. of the fore-mentioned Treatiſe) vpon another intolerable *miſtake* of Dr St. that whereas T. G. had ſaid in his Preface, that, it is a known Maxim, that none can giue to another that which he hath not himſelf; and therefore if the Church of Rome be guilty of

» Hereſy, much more of Idolatry, it falls
» vnder the Apoſtles Excommunication,
» and ſo remains depriued of *lawfull*
» *Authority* (mark the words, ſaith
» he,) *to vſe and excerciſe the power*
» *of Orders*, and conſequently the Autho-
» rity of Gouerning, preaching, and ad-
» miniſtring Sacraments, which thoſe of
» the Church of England challenge to
» themſelues, as deriued from the Church
» of Rome, can be no true and lawful
» Juriſdiction but vſurped and Antichriſ-
» tian. The plain and obuious ſenſe of
» which words ſaith he, is that He who
» hath no Juriſdiction, but is depriued of
» it by the Church's Cenſures, cannot
» giue it to another. Neither can He that
» hath no lawful Authority to ordain,
» lawfully ordain any, or giue Authority
» lawfully to ordain others. Now comes
» Dr. St. in his General Preface to ward
» off this blow, but never man did it leſs
» dexterously, and we muſt wholly attri-
» bute it to his litle Skil in fencing He
» tells vs that the Council of Trent pro-
» nounces Anathema againſt thoſe that
» deny the validity (*obſerve here alſo,*
» *what he the word* Validity) of the Sa-
» crament adminiſtred by one in mor-
tal ſin, in caſe he obſerves the Eſſentials

of it; and in this gross errour he runs on for 9. or 10. Pages, (*he might have said almost as many* leaves) citing Author after Author to prove that the Sacrament of Order is validly given by one in mortal sin or Excommunicated. But what is all this, *Saith E. W.* to T. Gs. most true Assertion? that none guilty of Idolatry, or Heresy can give *Jurisdiction* to any of the Church of England (which they must have from Catholick Bishops, or wholly want it,) or impower them to ordain others lawfully, when they are deprived them selves, of all lawful Authority to use or exercise the power of Orders? Hence you *see, saith he*, Dr. Sts. *blindness*, who argues from the validity of giving Orders, to the lawful giving them, *&c.* Thus E. W. And such a *publick rebuke* one would think, had been sufficient to make Dr. St. *open* his *Eyes*, and consider *what* it was that his *Adversary* objected; if he intended ever more to speak to this Argument. But as if he were wholly insensible of the gross and *intolerable errour* E. W. taxed him with, (whether *Stun'd* with the blow of the *Beetle*, or not having any thing else to

answer, he runs again into the *same* shameful *mistake*, and instead of defending that *the first Bishops of the Church of England receiued lawful Authority to vse and exercise the Power of Orders* which T. G. denied they could, in case *their Ordainers* were guilty of *Idolatry*, he falls vpon him afresh in his late defence, as if *he denied the validity of Orders giuen by a Bishop in case of Idolatry*. And that his Reader may see, he was resolued notwithstanding the *Rebukes* of E. W. to goe on in the *same* track still, he tells him pag. 795. that *hauing formerly showed, in his General Preface, that no Act of Ordination is invalid in case of any Heresy or crime of the Giuer, and that the contrary Doctrine is condemned for Heresy by the* Church, *he shall now particularly shew, that the Power of giuing Orders is not taken away by the guilt of Idolatry*; which he there proceeds to *proue* from the case of the, *Arian* Bishops; *And if I can make it appear* saith he, *that the Arian Ordinations were allowed, I shall put this matter beyond dispute, that the Charge of Idolatry doth not null the Ordinations of our Church, as being derived from*

tho'e who were guilty of Idolatry. Thus Dr. St. after he had been *publickly* told of his *miſtake*. And what is this but to tell vs, that howeuer E. W. and T. G, vrge him, the *one* with a *Pen*, the *other* with a *Beetle* to ſhew how the *firſt* Proteſtant *Biſhops* could haue any *lawful* Juriſdiction or Authority to exerciſe the *power* of *Orders*, in caſe *their Ordainers* were guilty of *Idolatry*, he is reſolued neuertheleſs to take *no notice* at all of that (which was the *onely* thing in *diſpute*) but will *fight* on ſtil couragiously againſt a *Shadow* of his own *making*, and put it beyond diſpute, that the *Act it ſelf of Ordination is not inualid in caſe of the Idolatry of the Gouers*, which was *neuer* denied by his Aduerſary. What ſhall I ſay here? Are the *Power* of giuing Orders, and *lawful Authority* to giue them, ſo *eſſentially* linked to each other, that they *cannot* be ſeparated? May not a *Biſhop* or *Prieſt* remaining ſo, be *deprived* of all *lawful* Authority to exerciſe their *Functions*, for hauing fallen into *Heresy* or *Idolatry*? And if they haue *none* themſelues, can they *giue it* to others? does not *Eſtius* cited by the Dr, affirm, that *no crime or*

Cenſure how hainy ſoeuer can hinder the validity of Ordination by a Biſhop although it be of thoſe who are not ſubiect to his Iuriſdiction? &c. By which it is manifeſt the *Power* of *Ordination* may haue its effect, where there is no *lawful Authority* to exerciſe it? And does not the *Church* of *England* ſuſpend her *Biſhops* and *Prieſts* in caſe of *thoſe* or the *like* crimes, and vpon their *repentance* admit them again without *re-ordination*? And if the *Proteſtant Biſhops* neither *haue* nor *could* haue any *lawful* Iuriſdiction derived vpon them, in caſe their *firſt Ordainers* were guilty of *Idolatry* and ſo could giue *none*, is there not all the *reaſon* in the world according to the Dr's *Irenicall* Principle of *the mutability of Church-Gouernment*, to take away *Epiſcopacy*, and *Subſtitute* ſome *other* in it's Place? Theſe are the *Points*, which Dr. St: ſhould haue ſpoken to, to *anſwer* his Adverſarys *argument*; but inſtead of doing that, to *mock* his *Reader*, and lauish away *time* and *paper*, as he does, to *proue* the *validity* of *Ordination* in caſe of the *Hereſy* or *Idolatry* of the giuer, (a point well *known* to T. G. before Dr. St took

upon him to *teach* him) is the greateſt ſign of *Tergiverſation*, to ſay no worſe, Jeuer yet met with.

Cathar. Here I confeſſ was *ground* enough, and *Provocation* enough for Dr. St to *ſee* what it was his Adverſary droue at, and *ſpeak* to the Point if he had thought *fit*. Why he did it not I doe not vnderſtand, but rather *wonde* he ſhould take ſuch *pains* to proue that the *Power* of giving Orders is *not* taken away by the guilt of *Idolatry*. Yet I obſerue that he does not poſitively aſſert *this* as his *own* Opinon, but layes it down rather as the *Doctrine* of the *Church* of *Rome*, to ſhew the litle *Skill* which T. G hath in his own *Church's affairs*: And I ſhould *wonder* more, were it other wiſe, when Dr. *Willet* contr. 16. qu. 2. de ord. part 4 (as I find him cited by my Friend *Patronus bonæ fidei*. p. 47) expreſsly affirmeth, that *Miniſters ordained in the Roman Church, are not true Presbyters, becauſe the Biſhops of that Church are not the Miniſters of Chriſt but of Antichriſt.*

Eun: This would be to make the force of T. Gs. *Argument* yet ſtronger, which it *may* be is *what* you would be

at. For if the *first Ordainers* were *no true Bishops*, those whom they ordained could be *none*, and much less could they receiue *lawful* Authority from them to *make* others. But how *wary* soever the Dr. be in expressing his thoughts, yet I doe not find, he any where *denies* the *Bishops* of the *Church* of *Rome* to be *true Bishops*: nor does T. G. concern himself to *disproue* the *validity* of the *Ordination* of the *Bishops* of the *Church* of *England*; but only to show it to be a *consequence* of Dr. St's *charge of Idolatry*, that they could haue no *lawful Authority* to exercise the power of Orders, in case their *first Ordainers* were *Idolaters*. And methinks T. G's. *Civility* in this Point, in *waiuing* the *Question* of the *validity* of *their* Ordination (a *Topick* vehemently insisted on by *those* of *his* Party) ought to haue preuailed with Dr. St. to haue treated him with more *Moderation*; and yet the *Importance* of the *Argument* haue induced him not to leaue it *vnspoken to*, in its full *force* and vtmost *consequence*; which was no less than the *actual change of Episcopal Government in England*, according to *his* Principles.

ciples. *Ordinary* Readers, if *Impartial*, will be at a loſs what to think of this; but thoſe of *better* capacity wil be apt to *ſuſpect*, (what it may be *you hope*) there was ſomething in the *bottome*, which made him ſo *careful* not to *touch* this Point; and ſo much the more, if they ſhall but *reflect* with themſelues, how things haue been *managed* by him in relation to it from the *beginning*, as.

1. His *publiſhing of* the doctrine of *the Mutability of Church-Government as the ſecular Magiſtrate ſhall ſee reaſon*, laid down by him at large in his *Irenicum*.

2. His *re-printing* that Book after the *Biſhops* were *re-eſtabliſhed* by law, and *humbly tendring it to Conſideration*.

3. His *cajolling* the very *Biſhops* themſelues in his *Preface*, with *what a rare example of ſelf-denyal, and of the higheſt Chriſtian Prudence it would be in them, to reduce the form of* Church *Government in England to its Primitiue ſtate and Order by retrenching all Exorbitances of Power*, (mark that) *and reſtoring thoſe Presbyteries, which no law hath forbidden, but only through diſuſe haue been laid aſide.*

4.ly when *this* would not *take* with *them* to make them *divest* themselues of what they thought to be their *Just Power*, his putting forth a Treatise to *charge* the *Church* of *Rome* with *Idolatry*, when neither of the *two Questions* proposed to him and his Aduersary requir'd it: and endeauouring to *fasten* that *charge* vpon the *Church* of *England* as her *Sense*, and so make *her* contribute to the *subuersion* of her *own* Authority. 5.ly when T. G. vrged vpon him, the want of *lawful* Iurisdiction as the *consequence* of this *charge*, and consequently that in *his* Principles there was *reason* enough for the *State* to think fit to take away *Episcopacy*; His *passing* this by, as if he saw it *not* and *trifling* with his Aduersary, about the *validity* of *Ordination* in case of *Heresy*. And, lastly, when E. W. put him in mind of *his duty*, as the *Champion* of the *Church* of *England*; and in *such* a manner as would *prouoke* a man of more *Phlegm*, than Dr. S. shows himself to be; His still letting it *alone* and running a *new descant* vpon the *old mistake*, viz. the *validity* of *Ordination* in case of the *Idolatry* of the *Giuers* of it: neither *retracting* his

Principles, nor ſpeaking to the *Point*, but leaving *Epiſcopacy*, as it is eſtabliſhed in the *Church* of *England*, vnder the *ſtrokes* of the *Beetle* to *ſhift* for it'ſelf, as it can. And what was this I pray (if you will not call it *attacquing*) but *to betray at leaſt the cauſe of the Church of England* as T. G. ſaith, whilſt he pretends to *defend* it?

Cathar: What my *ſentiment* is in this matter, I need not tell you. But I muſt needs tell you, I am *no* at all *ſatisfied* with the *Surmiſe* you caſt into the Readers mind of Dr St's *making* this *charge* of *Idolatry* vpon ſome *deſign* againſt the *Epiſcopall Government* eſtabliſhed in this land. This is a *great Secret* indeed, and transcends the power of the *Iudge of controverſies*, much more of any *private man* to dive into it.

Em: But you haue heard I hope of *ſome famous Prophetick pictures pretending to repreſent the fate of England, in which the chief thing obſervable (in ſeveral of them) is a Mole, a creature blind and busy ſmooth and deceitfull, continually working vnder ground, but now and then to be diſcerned by the diſturbance it makes in the ſurface of the Earth.*

Cath I remember very well that Dr. St begins his *Epistle Dedicatory* before his *defence* with this passage, as *so natural a description of a restlesse party among vs, that we need no Iudge of controversies to interpret the meaning of it.* But what do *you* infer from that *Prophetick Emblem?*

Eun: Nothing, but that we may see by the casting vp of the little *Hills*, which way the *Mole* works; and the *Church* of *England* may *iudge*, by the Drs. aforesa'd *managing* of the *charge* of *Idolatry*, to whom the *description* more *naturally* belongs, without either the *help* of the *Iudge of controversies*, or the *light* of the *Private spirit.*

Cathar. Well then, *leaving these things*, as T. G. does in his *Preface to those whom they concern*; as I haue giuen you hitherto the *Satisfaction* at least of a *fair hearing*, whilst you represented the *Motives* of your *dissatisfaction* with the *charge* of *Idolatry*, as managed by Dr. St; so now I expect you'l be so *kind*, as to giue me your *Opinion* of the *Book* you found me vpon at your *first* visit, viz. *Dr. St's late Defence of his Roman Idolatry in answer to T. G.* For although you haue occasionally

touch'd vpon *some* paſſages of it in our former diſcourſes, yet I would willingly hear what you think of the *whole*.

Eunom. This then (if you will needs haue it) ſhall be the *ſubiect* of another *Conference*. Only I ſhall leaue you a ſhort *Memorial* to conſider on, of the *matters* we haue hitherto diſcourſed, and it is *this*: that Dr. St. (as hath been ſhown) cannot *maintain* his charge of *Idolatry* againſt the *Church* of *Rome*. 1. without *diſſenting* from the Judg- *Dial.* 1.
ment of the *true* and *Genuine* ſons of the *Church* of *England*. 2ly not with- *Dial.* 2.
out offering *violence to the* 39. *Arti-*
cles. 3ly not without *denying* or aſſigning *Dial.* 3.
a *Church* in all ages *diſtinct* from all Conuenticles of *Heretick*s and *Schiſma-*
*tick*s, with which *Chriſtians* were *bound* to ioyn in *Communion*. 4ly not without *granting* the *Church* of *Rome* to *err* againſt a *Fundamentall* Point of *Faith*. 5ly not without *bringing* the *guilt* and *Dial.* 4.
Miſcheifs of the *Schiſm* vpon the *Maintainer*. 6ly not without quitting that grand *ſupporter* of the *Cauſe* the words, *Expreſsly prohibited in the ſe-*
cond Commandment. 7ly not without *frequent* and *manifeſt Self-Contradic-* *Dial.* 3. 4.

Dial. 5. *tions.* Lastly not without *subverting* all *lawful* Ecclesiastical *Authority* in the *Church* of *England.*

And if these things *cannot* be cleared (as hitherto by Dr Sts. behauiour it doth not appear to me they *can*) *That* must stand *good* which T. G asserts, as the *consequence* of *them*, viz that *the Charge of Idolatry* (especially as D. St. hath managed it) *is the most groundless, vnreasonable, and contradictory proceeding in the world.* And with this I take leaue at present.

The End of the First Part.

THE SECOND PART OF THE JUST DISCHARGE TO Dr. STILLINGFLEET'S VNJVST CHARGE OF IDOLATRY, &c.

Discovering

The vanity of his late Defence in his pretended Answer to a Book entituled

CATHOLICKS NO IDOLATERS

By way of Dialogue

Between { *EVNOMIVS, a Conformist.* & *CATHARINVS, a Non-Conformist.*

PARIS,
Printed for RENE' GVIGNARD, at the sign of S. Basil, in S. Jacques Street.
M. DC. LXXVII.
Avec Privilege du Roy.

THE FIRST DIALOGVE.

THE ARGUMENT.

A *Diſcovery of the Vanity of Dr.* St's *Endleſs diſcourſes in his late* Defence, *in relation to T. G. His Excellent Gloſſe of the Canon of the Church of England, concerning Bowing to the Altar; which* the Author of a late Treatiſe, entituled Patronus Bonæ Fidei, *by Arguments caſt in the Dr's own mould, contends to be Idolatry, worſe than that of the Romaniſts, or Ægyptians.*

CATHARINVS, EVNOMIVS.

Cathar: What *Judgment* to make of the *Memorial* you left me, I cannot easily *determin*. If the *Conſequences* contained in it be *falſe*, (as I hope they are) I cannot but *wonder* Dr. St, in his *Defence* should take ſo litle

notice of them? And if they be *true* *I wonder* as much, he should take so much *pains* to maintain the *Charge*; vnless it be to keep vp the *Cry* against *Popery*, by exposing the *Papists*, as *Idolaters*, to the *hatred* of all *Good Christians*. Other Pretences may *fail*; but *this* will be sure to take place, as *they* find by the success.

Eunom: The *Bulk* of a Book too, as you know, may conduce much to make the *Cry* the *Louder*. But were the *voice* a litle ouer, that men could *hear* one another *speak*, I am of Opinion there would not be many found of such aukward Intellectuals; as to believe it to be *Idolatry*, to *kisse* or put off our *hats*, or *kneel* before an *Image* or Picture of *Christ*, with *Intention* by those outward Acts to shew the *respect* we haue for *his* Person; which is *what* Dr. St. obliges himself to maintain when he asserts the *making* and *bowing before an Image with respect to the worship of God* to be forbidden under the *notion* of *Idolatry*: But doth it in *such* a manner, that I haue heard some *Learned men* say, they could look vpon his *Performance* in this Point, no otherwise than as an

Rom. Idol. p. 60. 62.

Essay of his *Wit*, like that of *Erasmus*, when he vndertook to write a Book in Commendation of *Folly*; but with *this* difference, that *Erasmus* foresaw *no harm* like to *ensue* from his *Panegyrick* to the world; for none were likely to be more in loue with it for his Praises, nor to suffer more for it, than if he had said nothing. But Dr St. could not but haue a *Prospect* at least of much. *Mischief* likely to *follow* to his Fellow-subjects from his *Idle Charge of Idolatry*, as Mr. *Thorndike* call'd it a litle before his death.

Cathar. How euer others may look vpon his Performance, For my part I think I haue reason to hope (as he doth himself) of his *Defence*, that it will *be a Prophetical Confutation of all that T. G. will euer be able to say vpon this subject*. Although (if it be true w at the Dr. sai;h of him in his Epist. Dedicat.) *H hath said as much in defence of the Romam cause, as wit and subtilty could invent; But withall he wishes he could speak as freely of his Fair-dealing and ingenuity.*

Eun. Egregiam sane laudem. a very ample *Encomium* no doubt as to the

first part of it, and such a one as addes no small glory to the Dr's *Triumph*, to drag such an Adversary after the wheels of his Chariot. But if you take it togetherwith the 2d part, I. can by no means allow it to be *a good definition*, as being such *a Collection* of *Properties*, as is found with more advantage in a *Subject* much neerer home. Witness the *Tast* I haue given you even now of the Dr's own *Fair-dealing and Ingenuity*; and of which I may have occasion to give you farther Instances before we end.

Cathar. These are such *Complements* as pass between Adversaries when each hopes and designs to lay the other in the dust. But to come to the Point we were entring upon, and which you promised to speak to at our last parting. Haue you not read the Dr's *Defence*.

Eun. Yes I have, but to deal ingenuously with you, not with that *pleasure* and *Satisfaction*, you expres'd, at the *beginning* of our discourse, to see that *the Heathens could not be justly charged with Idolatry, but the Papists must be so too*. For naturally I *loue* not to see People *represented worse than they*

are; and though Dr. *St.* professe he *loues not to* [illegible], yet his Readers will *iudge* as they find cause Besides, I euermore *hated* a great *Volume* vpon *one* Subiect, as supposing much *time* must be *lost* in reading many things which are crowded in *not* to the *purpose*: However like *those*, who put themselues (as we say) into the *Stocks* to comply with the *Fashion*, I resolved as I saw others do, to *venture* vpon it; And to tell you the truth, I had scarcely gotten ouer *half a score Leaues*, when I found my self in the *case* of the vnfortunate *Laconian* in *Boccalini*.

Cathar. And what was *that* I pray?

Eun. Why, *this* it was. The poor Man for having *deliuered* that in *three* words, which might haue been said in *two*, after eight month's *imprisonment*, was condemned to *read* ouer the *Warr* of *Pisa* written by *Guicciardine*. So horribly tedious did that *rabble* of discourse appear to him, that after he had *read ouer* the *first* leaf with much *agony*, he earnestly intreated the *Judges* to reuerse the *Sentence*, and *condemn* him rather to *row* in the *Gallies* all his life. What other *Sentiment* could I haue of *my*

Condition, than that of this vnhappy *Laconian*, to see my self *condemned*, (for what fault of mine I know not) by that Tyrant *custome*, to *read* ouer Dr. St's *endless discourses*? First a *hundred* and *fourscore* and *three* Pages, *Of T. Gs. notion of Idolatry*. Then a *hundred* and *threescore* and *four* Pages, *Of the Nature of divine Worship*. Then a *hundred* and *fourty* Pages, *Of the State of the Controuersy about the worship of Images between Christians and Heathens*. After that a *hundred* and *fourscore* and odd Pages, *Of the State of the Controuersy about Images in the Christian Church*. Then a *hundred* and *thirteen* Pages, *Of the sense of the second Commandment*. And lastly *Fourscore* and *thirteen* Pages more, In answer *to the Instances and some other Passages of T. G.* However, I resolued (as I said) to *read* them over; but all the while I was doing it, I conld not but think, had the *Book* been brought before the *Iudges* of *Parnassus*, what *punishment* they *would* or *could* haue inflicted suitable to the *delict*, viz, for a man of Dr. Sts. parts to spend neer *nine hundred* Pages (if you take in the

Epiſtle dedicatory and the *Preface*) in *deliuering* that, which might haue been *expreſſed* ſufficienthy for what concerns T. G in *nine* or *ten* lines.

Cahar: You *amaze* me with *this* diſcourſe; and I ſhall look vpon *it*, as no other than a *dream* vpon *Parnaſſus*, vnleſſ you give me *good reaſon* for it.

Eun: Content; but then you muſt haue *patience*, whilſt I giue you the *reaſon*: and *this* it is: Had Dr. St. according to the *Method* vſed by the *Mathematicians*, but laid down theſe *few* Points as *Poſtulata*, viz. 1. That *Idolatry may conſiſt with the acknowledgment of one Supream Being*, which is the *ſubiect* of his *firſt* Chapter. 2. That *God ought to be worshipped according to his own appointment*; or that *thoſe external acts of worship, which God hath appropriated to himſelf, cannot, while that appropriation remains, be given to another*, which is *what* he *aymes* at in his ſecond. 3. That *the Wiſer Heathens pretended, they did not look vpon their Images as Gods, but as Symbols of that Being to which they gaue divine worship*, which is the *Scope*

of his *Third*. And 4. That *for the four first Centuries there was little or no use of Images in the Temples and Oratories of Christians*; but that the *use* and *Veneration* of them came in *afterwards* by degrees, which is the *subject* of his *Fourth*. Had the Dr. I say laid these *Positions* down as *Postulata*, he might (if I understand T. G. aright) have *saued* himself the *pains* of *writing*, and his Readers the *trouble* of *reading* more than *two third* Parts of his Book which are spent vpon them.

For as for the 1 That *Idolatry may consist with the acknowledgment of one Supream Being*, at least as *Idolatry* is taken by Dr. St. for the giving *External Acts* of worship due only to *God*, to a *Creature*, and was sufficient as it was practis'd by his *Wiser Heathens*, for the Fathers to charge them with *Idolatry*; it is plainly acknowledged by T. G. Page 23 of his *first Paper* where speaking of those, of whom S. *Paul* saith, that *though they knew God, they did not glorify him as God*. T. G. saith, *they changed his glory into an Image made like to corruptible man, by adoring and offering sacrifice due to God alone*

to the Statues themselues, or the deities they supposed to dwell in them: and the same he repeats again Pag 97. and other *Places* of his Book.

For the 2. That *God is to be worshipped with external Acts according to his own appointment &c.* This is no where *denied* by T. G. but is *supposed* by him Pag. 29. where he saith, that *if God haue forbidden himself to be worshipped after such a manner, the giving him such worship will be a dishonouring him, though the Giuer intend it neuer so much for his honour*, much more then, the *giuing* acts of *worship appropriated to him to* another.

The 3 also concerning the *Practice of the Wiser Heathens* is *admitted* by T. G. for the Dr. to make his *best* of it, when he saith p. 107 108. that *howeuer they pretended through the Images to worship the true deitie, yet they were to blame in two things. 1. Because the Images being instituted by publick Authority for the worship of false Gods they concurred (as Dr. St. himself acknowledges) with the vulgar in all the External practices of their Idolatry. 2. Because, though in the schools they denied them*

to be Gods neuertheleſſ they gaue honour to them ſo farr, as to lead the People into errour by their Example.

And for the 4. *the litle or no uſe of Images in Churches for the firſt four hundred years*, it was not looked upon by T. G. as any *Prejudice* to *his* cauſe although it had been much longer before the *uſe* and *Veneration* of *them* were brought in, as he ſufficiently *declares* (p. 171.) where he anſwers in Mr. *Thorndikes* words, that *for the firſt three or four Centuries, there might be Jealouſy of Offence in having Images in Churches, before Idolatry was quite rooted out, of which afterwards there might be no appearance.* And therefore *they were afterwards admitted all ouer, for it is manifeſt*, ſaith he *the Church is tied no farther, than there can appear danger of Idolatry.* And again, p. 173. *What furniture and Ceremonies the Churches of Chriſtians, and the publick worship of God in them may require, now all the world profeſſes Chriſtianity, this*, ſaith he, *the Church is at freedome to determin by the word of God expounded according to the beſt agreement of Chriſtians.* And whilſt the *Church* is acknow-

ledged to haue *ſuch* a Power in decreeing *Rites* and *Ceremonies* (of which *nature* the *uſe* of *Images* is) as ought to *ouer-rule* a *ſcrupulous Conſcience*, what the Dr. *obiects* againſt Mr. *Thorndikes* reaſon concerning the *danger* of *Idolatry* in after times, comes not *Home* to the purpoſe; For t'is not *his ſcrupulous Conſcience*, but the *Church* that muſt be the *Iudge*. What *need* was there then to lauiſh away *ſix hundred and ſeuenty Pages*, to proue *thoſe* things which were either *granted* or *giuen* as granted by T. G.?

But then again for the 5. Chapter, *Of the ſenſe Of the ſecond Commandment*, if God haue there *expreſly prohibited the giuing any worſhip to himſelf by an Image*, as Dr. St. affirms, there *needed* no more than to *expoſe* the *Law*, as in a *Table*, printed in Legis-latiue *Gothick* (as it is done by him. p. 671.) with the addition only of a *Finger* in the Margent to point to the *words* for euery one that *runs* to read them: the *thing* being ſo *plain*, that himſelf confeſſes, *it cannot enter into his mind, how God ſhonld haue forbidden it by more expreſſ and Emphatical words than he*

Roman Idol. p. 59.

hath done. If this be ſo, then certainly it was a needleſſ and ſtrange *Extravagance*, to ſpend a *hundred* and *thirteen* Pages to ſpeak that in *leſſ* Expreſſ and Emphatical terms, (that is to ſay, *more obſcurely*) what God had already ſpoken in a few words *more clearly*; and in *criticizing* as he doth vpon the words, *Idol*, *Image*, *Similitude* &c. and drawing arguments 1. *from the Terms of the law*, 2. *from the Reaſon annexed to it*, and 3. *from the Judgment of the Lawgiuer*, to *find* out what himſelf *cannot conceiue how God ſhould haue expreſſed it in clearer terms*. For my part, I beleiue, that *God* can *expreſſ* himſelf much *clearer* than *Man*: and yet I muſt be of T. G's. *mind* in this caſe, that had the *Law* been deliuered in Dr. Sts. *own* words (Rom: Idol p. 60. viz that *any Image or ſimilitude is forbidden to be made with reſpect to the worſhip of God*,) *they had been much more expreſſ and Emphatical to his purpoſe*, than *thoſe* in which *God* himſelf did *deliuer* it. For *theſe* we ſee require much *criticizing* and many *arguments* to make the *ſenſe* be, what Dr. St. *would* haue it; where as *thoſe* are ſo

Cath. no Idol. p. 30.

plain, that euery one that *reads*, vnderſtands their *meaning* at the firſt ſight It was *well* for T. G. that *God* himſelf was pleaſed to *write* the *Commandment* with his *own* finger. For had Dr. St. been truſted with the *penning* of it, he would no doubt, (if it be true what he ſays) haue *out-done* God himſelf, though he had done his beſt.

As for the *laſt* Chapter, where Dr. St. ſets himſelf to show the *difference* between the *Inſtances* brought by T. G. viz, *the Reverence shewd to the Ground by Moſes and Joshua, the bowing at the name of Jeſus, and towards the Altar*, vſed by the *Church* of *England* on the one ſide, and the *reſpect* and *Veneration* given to *Images* by thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome* on the other: (the moſt *material* thing in *that* Chapter) I think there *needed* no more than to ſay, as he doth in *two* lines p 869. that *the Church of England doth not allow any worship to be giuen to the Altar*: meaning thereby, as I ſuppoſe, that the *Church* of *England* intends not by the *external* Act of *Bowing* to *the* any *Reverence* to the *Altar*. This you ſee is a

very *compendious*, and yet *clear decision* of the *case*; and there *needed* no more, to *defeat* the other *Instances* also brought by T. G. For if he speak *consequently*, the *same* must hold with him for *them* too. But then on the other side, you must giue me leaue to tell you, that I doe not see how *this Assertion* of Dr. St. agrees either with the *sense* of the *Church* of *England* in the *Canon* he appeals to for it, or with what himself affirms but *three* leaues before. For the *Canon* saith no more (and I cannot but wonder why he caused it to be printed in *great Characters* for the world to take *notice* of his fair dealing) than that *their Intention in doing Reverence and Obeisance at the coming in or going out of the Church or Chancel, is not to exhibite any Religious worship to the Communion Table &c.* in which *they* agree with *Aquinas* and other *Divines* of the *Church* of *Rome*; but no where *deny* they intend not to giue *any worship* at all to it, as the Dr. *glosses* it. Nor does it agree with what himself had affirmed but three leaues before p. 863. that *there is a Reverence*

left to be shewed to Sacred Places, on the account of their discrimination from other places, and separation for Sacred uses.

Cathar: But the Dr. you know distinguishes between *Reverence* and *Worship*; and it is *this latter*, which he charges with *Idolatry*, as it is an *Expression of our submission to a meer inanimate thing*.

Eun: But if *those* of the *Church* of *Rome* by the word *Worship* in the case of *Images* declare, they require no more *by the terms of Communion with her*, but *Reverence*, or (as they call it) *a honourary respect and Veneration*, the Dr. must either lay down his charge of *Idolatry* against the *Church* of *Rome*, or if he wil maintain a *Reverence due to sacred Places and things*, he must put himself in, and the *Church* of *England* too (if it be her cause) for company.

Cathar. This I confess hath stuck long in my thoughs; and to tell you the truth, (now that you vrge it a *second* time) I was never throughly satisfied either with Dr. Sts. *practice* or *defence* in this Point; For though

I hope well ſtill of his *Affection* to the *Cauſe*, yet it cannot be denied, but his *bending complyance* in this particular of *bowing* to the *Altar*, hath giuen but too much *advantage* to his *Adverſaries*, and too much *Offence* to the *Godly*: whoſe ſenſe I ſhall giue you in the words of my good Friend *Patronus bonæ Fidei*, with relation to the Dr. The diſcourſe is ſomewhat of the *longeſt*, but I hope you will haue *patience* to hear it. Thus then *He* in his *Prodromus* p 76.

Quicquid Clariſſimus Stillingfleet Delinitus & occæcatus &c. *However the moſt Renowned Stillingfleet wheadled and blinded with me,* (I dare ſay no more for fear of a Rebuke) *endeauour in his moſt learned and accurate work to dawb and ſmooth ouer* (*and that but ſleightly neither*) *this kind of Adoration, with intention to vindicate it from the crime of Idolatry, leſt himſelf amidſt the crowd of thoſe who bow down before the Altar be deem'd guilty of a crime, which none hath thrown with more ſtrength vpon the Romaniſts, than He; yet I doubt not,* ſaith he, *to affirm, that this Bowing out vies the Idolatry both of the Egyptians and Romaniſts,*

Romanists, not only in horrible iniquity and enormitis, but in madness and folly.

Having laid down this for his *Position*, he proceeds to *prove* it in this manner. *And first for the Romanists; It is not* saith he, *so much Madness in them to adore the Lord Jesus under the species of Bread, as it is a gross Errour in the ground of the thing, viz, their believing the Bread to be in very deed Transubstantiated, as they call it, into the Body of Christ. But it is no other than the dotage of Hypochondriacks, and a meer giddy-brain'd stupidity for men to perform their Adorations towards that place, where Christ is no more present, than any where else, and where neither the Table nor the Altar, nor any thing that is set upon the Table (unless perchance a clean Towell, two Books richly bound, or a pair of Candlesticks with two Candles in them, not to be lighted, till their minds be quite drunk with Popery) represent either Christ or his Image; A Fanatical Adoration*, as he calls it, *without any Object.*

2. *For the Ægyptians; They*, saith

» he, *pretended some colour for their Idolatry, as that an Ape, a cat, a Wolf a Bull, an Ibis, were things endowed with that Principle of life, with that ayr and participation of the divinity, by which the worshippers were carried to God, whom alone they made the Object of their Adoration; denying any thing to be worshipped by them but with relation to God, as we learn from Origen against Celsus, and Augustin upon the 96. Psalm. where this latter farther adds, that the Heathens pretended they did not worship any corporeal Representation (and that it was a meer calumny imputed to them by the Christians) but the divinity, which was represented and expressed by such an Effigies. So that now Those who bow down to a logge, a Stock, and a Trunk, such as is a Woodden Table out of the use for which it is ordained, are Themselues stocks, and render themselues guilty of a farr more greiuous crime, I am sure, of a farr more giddy-brain'd Madness, than either the Ægyptians or the Romanists. For what Dr. Stillingfleet saith, that this worship is performed only in the coming in, and going out of the Temple,*

takes not away the crime of Idolatry, as more or leſſe changes not the kind: Nor doth it agree with Truth &c.

This done and hauing very fitly *applied* to them for their frequent and *profound* Adorations (ſo *low* that they *almoſt knock* ſaith he, *the pauement with their Fore-heads*) thoſe *words* of *Perſius*.

O curuæ in terras Animæ, & cœleſtium inanes!

He goes on ſaying, that *this Fanaticiſm is the more groſſ and blockish, in that the Altar or Table it ſelf are not ſo much worshipped, as the Place for it's rich Furniture in which they are ſet. For let them be remoued but neuer ſo little from the Wall, and placed without the Rails: Let but the Euchariſtical decking be taken away, and they left naked, and transferred to ſome other part of the Temple, no man thinks them worthy of Adoration; no man bows down (vnleſſ perchance to the Eaſt.) A madneſſ Paralel to that of the Romaniſts, who haue a Reverence and Veneration for their Images, while they are ſet vp in high Places, and ſo much the more as they are more richly attired and*

adorned, but being taken from thence,
» *or laid upon the ground or broken, no*
» *one thinks them worthy to be look'd*
» *on.*

» Nor is this all. He affirms yet far-
» ther, that *this Bowing to the Altar,*
» *doth not only out-vy in its Enormity*
» *the Idolatry both of the Ægyptians and*
» *Romanists, but, although we had neuer*
» *heard,* saith he, *of their Idolatry; yet*
» *this is such, that it fights against Reas-*
» *it self, and that* Analogy *or Relation*
» *there is between an Altar and it's Cor-*
» *relate,* (i. é. a Sacrifice) *for which*
» *reason, the old English Superstition*
» *vnder Popery in the Book of Windsor,*
» *did with much congruity command the*
» Adoration *to be performed* Deo & Altari,
» *to God and to the* Altar, *or Host, in wh ch*
» *the true Body of* Christ *was believed to*
» *be. But for as much as the* Altar *we*
» *speak of at present, hath no such Host*
» *upon it, no, not so much as the Bread;*
» *for any one to bow down to it, it can be*
» *judged no other, than Irrational and*
» Absurd, *because there is no true* Altar
» *without an Host.*

Lastly (not to exercise your *patience* too too much) he concludes with a

Conſideration, which, he ſaith, *ſhows this Rite of bowing to the Altar, to be the Symptom of a mind perfectly mad, viz, becauſe no Adoration was euer made, nor ought to be made by thoſe who worſhip God rightly, but with eyes and mind fixed and intent vpon and towards the Propitiatory or Mercy-Seat; which is no other than Chriſt reconciling Sinners to God, and He ſitting at the right hand of his Father; not ſtanding in that place, where the Romaniſts Altar was placed.*

Eunon: This is a *diſcourſe* which ſhows the *Author* to be a *Son of Thunder* indeed. May I not know what other *name* he hath?

Cathar: He wanted neither *courage* nor *zeal* I can aſſure you, to haue *put* it to his *Book*; and there was much *ado* to perſwade him *not* to do it. But at length he ſuffered himſelf to be *prevailed* with, *licèt ægrè*, (as he ſaith in his *Admonition* to the Reader) by the importunity of a *Friend* to *leaue out* his name, out of a true *Chriſtian Charity*, as I take it, not to *ſtirr* vp the *Bile* of the *Hierarchicks* too much. Moreouer alſo, not to *hazard* the

loſing ſo worthy a *Member* as Dr. *Stillingfleet* by ſome *free Reflections* (as he calls them) vpon his *complyance*, he was contented, after his *Book* was *finished*, in a *leaf* printed apart to be *inſerted* towards the latter *end* of it to ſet *Dr. Stillingfleet's name* in the middle, between *Gournall* and *Conant*, on the one ſide, and *Meriton* and *Neſton* on the other, and ſo repreſent *them all* together, as *Men who vpon the change of affairs, had ioined themſelues to the Hierarchicks, not out of hope of Lucre or a more plentifull fortune, but out of the dictamen of Conſcience, holding faſt*, ſaith he, *to that Principle, that ſeparation is not to be made from the Publick Miniſtery, but for very weighty cauſes, yet not ſo, as that they laid aſide their former more fauourable Inclinations to the Puritans.*

Eun: *This* by your leaue ſeems to me to be nothing, but *plain dawbing* with that *vntempered Morter*, of which the *Prophet Ezechiel* ſpeaketh in his 13ᵗʰ Chapter. For what can be more *inconſiſtent*, than to make the *publick Miniſtery Idolatrous*, as your Friend *doth*, and then acknowledge, *they ioin in it for Cou-*

science sake? T. G. himself (the man of *Intentions*) acknowledges that *be the Intention neuer so good, yet if the Act be forbidden, the doing it will be vnlawfull.* And which way soeuer the Dr. *turn* him, he will find himself, if I be not deceiued in a case of *much* Perplexity. For if he maintain a *Reverence* to be *shewed* to the *Altar*, he puts *himself* in for company with the *Romanists*, and must either *acquit* them, or *incurr* himself the *guilt* of *Idolatry*. And if he deny *any* to be giuen, yet he stands *condemned* of *Idolatry, worse than that of the Aegyptians or Romanists* by your Friend the *Patron*, for performing the *external act of worship* towards the *Altar*, and very agreeably, to I take it, to *his Principles*, who asserts the *External act* to be *forbidden, Idolatrous* in the second Commandment, whereas the *only external act expressly* there *forbidden*, is that of *Bowing*, *Thou shalt not bow down to them.* But these things require a larger discussion. What I intended at present, was not to *engage* in a particular *dispute*, but to let you see, (as I said at first) that what Dr. St. hath with much

labour to *himself*, and *pain* to his *Readers* delivered in *nine hundred Pages* might haue been done ſufficiently (ſo far forth, as it relates to the *Conteſt* between *him* and T. G.) in *nine* or *ten* lines; For there *needed* no more, than to put down in *Gothick* Character, the *Four Poſtulat's* aboue mentioned, *The words of the Second Commandment*; and his *own* Excellent *Gloſſ of the Canon of the Church of England*. For the *Poſtulata's* were *granted*, or *giuen* for *granted*, before hand, by T. G. The *words* of the Commandment, are according to him ſo *Expreſſ and Emphatical, that it cannot enter his mind how God ſhould haue made them more*, and therefore they *needed* not the *Explication* of *man*. And laſtly *his* Gloſſ of the *Canon*, that *it allows no worship to be giuen to the Altar*, ſuperſedes all trouble of showing any *farther difference* between the Ceremony of *bowing to the Altar*, and the other *Inſtances* produced by T. G. on the one ſide and to *that* of *Bowing* before an *Image* on the other.

Cathar. By this I ſee, you think the Dr. might haue *ſpared* all his *long* and

and *elaborate* discourses vpon *these* subiects, as *vnnecessary*, and consequently his *whole Book* excepting *nine* or *ten* lines. *This* doubtlesse would haue been a great *Contentment* to T. G.

Eun: I, and to many *others* besides him, who would haue been *glad* to haue *saued* both their *money* and *Time*.

Cathar: But *what* is it then you iudge *necessary* the Dr. should haue done?

Eun: *That* if you please shall be the *Subiect* of our *next* Conference.

THE SECOND DIALOGVE.

THE ARGVMENT.

WHat Dr. St. ought to haue done to maintain his Charge. The first thing was to haue laid down the true Notion of Idolatry in the Nature of the thing, antecedently to any Positiue Prohibition. The Notion he giues of it shown to be insufficient; and the Heathens not iustly chargeable with Idolatry by vertue of it. The Consequence he vrges from the worship of Images to a like worship of all other Beings declared vseless: And a Specimen *given of his rare Insight in Mystical Theology.*

CATHARINVS. EVNOMIVS.

Cathar. You promised, *Eunomius*, to tell me at our next meeting,

what it was the Dr. *ought* to haue *done*, but hath *not* done to maintain his *charge* of *Idolatry*. And I pray let me know, *what* it is without ſuſpending my *longing* with another *Preamble* like that of the unfortunate *Laconian*.

Eun: I ſhall do my endeavour to comply with your *deſire* both in the *one* and the *other*. *Nature* and *Art*, you know, both tell us, that the *firſt* thing to be done in a *Diſpute* (if the *diſcovery* of *Truth* and *ſatisfaction* of the Reader be *intended*) is to ſettle the *State* of the *Controverſy* vpon its right *Grounds*. And that nothing tends more effectually to the *doing* of it, than to lay down the *true Notion* of the *matter* in debate; without which though much *Wit* perhaps may be shown, and much *Reading* too, yet *All* to litle purpoſe. What therefore I think Dr. St. *ought* to haue done, had his buſineſſe been to manage his *Charge* of *Idolatry* ſo as not to *amuze*, but *ſatisfy* his Reader, was in the *Firſt* place to haue given us the *true notion* of *Idolatry* in the *nature* of the *thing*; and then in the ſecond place to haue shown *that Notion* to haue agreed to the *Honour* and *Ve-*

neration, which the *Church* of *Rome* in her *Councils* declares may be given to the *Images* of *Christ* and the *Saints*. This had been to *set* the matter in it's *true light*; But he choſe rather to *dazle* the eyes of the Reader with the *falſe* lights of meer *External Acts*, the obſcure *practice* euen of the *Wiſer Heathens*, and the *clashing* of *School-divines*.

Cath. Euery one you know, *Eunomius*, is at liberty, eſpecially the *Accuſer*, to lay and *manage* his *Charge* in the *Method* and way he deems *beſt* for his *cauſe*. And al though Dr. St. haue drawn in theſe *Auxiliaries* to his Aſſiſtance, and inſiſt very *much* vpon *them*; yet methinks you are much *miſtaken* when you ſay he hath *omitted* thoſe things, which you iudge to be the only *neceſſary* ones. And for the *firſt* of them I cannot but *wonder*, how you could *forget*, that the *firſt* thing he aduances, in the very *firſt* Page of his *Defence*, to make *good* his *Charge* of *Idolatry*, is *to lay down the right Notion* of it. *I begin*, ſaith he, *with the conſideration of the nature of Idolatry, not only becauſe my Adverſary calls me to it in theſe*

words, [Here the Axe is laid to the Root, and if euer the Dr. will speak home to the purpose, it must be vpon this Point: He must speak to the Nature of the thing &c.] *But because the weight of the whole matter depends vpon it.* And then hauing *refuted* T. Gs. *notion* of *Idolatry* at large in his *first* Chapter he lays down the *Notion* of *Divine worship* in the *Second.* What could haue been done more *Methodically* by the best *School-Divine* of them all?

" Catho. no Idol. " p. 203.

Euno: This was a *fair Beginning* indeed, had he gone on to pursue it in the *sense* it was *proposed* by his Adversary, but like a *Preacher*, that has patch'd vp a *Sermon* out of his *note-Book*, he names the *Text*, and then takes his *leaue* of it. What his Adversary *call'd* him to in *that* place, was *to speak to the Notion of Idolatry in the Nature of the thing, independently of any Positive law.* For speaking *there* of the *Reverence* shown by *Moses* and *Joshua* to the *Ground* by putting of their *shoes*, he saith, *If it were Idolatry in the nature of the thing to put off their shoes in Reverence to the Ground, God's*

"

"

» *command could not make it to be otherwise.*
» *And if it were not Idolatry in it ſelf to do*
» *it, neither is it to giue a like honour to the*
» *Image of Chriſt. From whence it followeth,*
» *to the v ter ruine of all the Dr hath ar-*
» *gued f om his pretended Prohibition, that*
» *as no command of God can make that to be*
» *not I dolatry, which is ſo in the nature of*
» *the thing: ſo no Prohibition (if there*
» *were any) could make that to be Idola-*
» *try, which hath not in it the true and*
» *Real nature of Idolatry.* This done he
» tells the Dr. *Here it is the Axe is laid*
» *to the Root, and if euer he will ſpeak home*
» *to the purpoſe, it muſt be vpon this Point.*
» *He muſt ſpeak to the nature of the thing.*
This is what T. G. *call'd* him to: and I ſaw very plainly there muſt be *ſuch* a thing as. *Idolatry independently of any Poſitive law of God*; and that Dr. St. by the manner of his *Procedure* was engaged to ſpeak to *it:* becauſe otherwiſe the *Heathens* (of whom he makes *ſo much* vpon all occaſions) before that *Law* was made, and afterwards alſo, if not *promulgated* to them, could not haue been iuſtly *charged* with *Idolatry*. This therefore I carried along with me in my mind, whilſt I *read* ouer his

diſcourſes. But after I had *tired* my ſelf with ſeeking for it in his *firſt* Part conſiſting of *three hundred* and *forty ſeuen* Pages, in which he pretends to conſider the *nature* of *Idolatry*, I found that in the *firſt Chapter* he impoſed a *fallacious Notion* of the *Heathens Idolatry* vpon T. G. for himſelf to *triumph* in impugning it, viz that the *particular Idolatry* of the *Heathens* conſiſted in giuing *Diuine worship* to the *Diuel*, as if T. G. had aſſerted *them* to be *Idolaters* vpon no other account: And in the *Second* he giues no other *notion* of it himſelf, but *that* of an *External* Act of *worship* ſtanding vnder a ſuppoſed (but not proued) *Prohibition*. For although he *aſſure* T. G. vpon his word, p. 269. that *he meant very Real Idolatry*, yet he immediately adds that it was vpon *this Reaſon*, *becauſe it belongs* (ſaith he) *to God to appropriate Acts of worship to himſelf, and that hauing appropriated them, they become only due to him*. And after a long diſcourſe to the *ſame* purpoſe, (though *nothing* to the purpoſe) he tells vs over again p 275. for fear we ſhould *miſtake* him, that *the meaning of it*

all is no more, than to show that Adoration of Images *is* Idolatry *by vertue of that Commandment.* And by the way is in such a *chafe* with T. G. for offering to vnderstand *some words* of *his* to imply *Real Idolatry* antecedently to any *Prohibition*, that he compares the attempt to a *Thunder-Shower full of sulphur and darkness with a terrible Crack*, and looks vpon *Gun-powder, as a needless Invention to blow a Man vp in comparison of a Train of Consequences from his own words, let but T. G. have the laying of it.* Nothing then can be more evident, than that the Dr. notwithstanding his *fair proposal*, meant not to speak to the *nature* of *Idolatry* in it't self, which his Adversary *call'd* him to, and vpon which *the weight of the whole matter in debate depends*; particularly *that* which concerns the *Heathens*, as I said before; and *which* for the want of it must needs *fall* to the ground. For if by *very Real Idolatry* he mean no more, than that to giue any *worship* to *God* by an *Image* is *such* only vpon the account of being *forbidden* by a *Positive Law*, viz, the 2^d^ Commandment, all the *arguments*, he draws from

the ſuppoſed *Practice* of the *Heathens*, as worshipping the *true God* by their *Images* (which make vp well neer *one half* of his Book) are *blown* vp with this rare *Invention* of *his*, and made of *no uſe* either to *himſelf* or his *cauſe*; becauſe the *Law* not being *ginen* or *promulgated* to them, they can be no *farther* concerned in *what* is forbidden by it, than as it is *evil* in its ſelf *antecedently* to any ſuch Poſitiue *Prohibition*.

Cathar; But, as Dr. St. ſaith very well, p. 263. *What notion of Idolatry could the Heathens haue, but what was the ſame the Jews had from the Law of Moſes? The notion of Idolatry was a new thing among them, who knew no harm at all in giuing Diuine honour to Creatures. From whence ſhould they vnderſtand the ſinfulneſſ and the nature of it, if not from ſome Law of God?*

Eun: This was *kindly* done of the Dr, to make this *Apology* for the poor *Heathens*, who had ſtood him in *ſo much* ſtead. But had not his *kindneſſ* made him *forget* what S. *Paul* ſaith Rom. 2. that *when the Gentiles who haue not the Law, do by nature the things contained in the Law, theſe hauing not the Law*

are a Law vnto themselues, who shew the worke of the Law written in their hearts, their Conscience bearing witnesse, and their thoughts between themselues accusing or else excusing one another? And how by vertue of *this Law*, which was written in their hearts, and *not* of the *Law* of *Moses*, the same *Apostle* in the Precedent Chapter declared them *inexcusable* for giuing *diuine honour* to *Creatures*; because *that which may be known of God, was manifest in them: for God*, saith he, *manifested it to them, in as much as the Inuisible things of him, euen his Eternal Power and diuinity are seen from the Creation of the world, being vnderstood by the things that are made.* Here you see S. *Paul* plainly asserts a *Law* written in their hearts by which they *might* and *ought* to haue vnderstood the *nature* and *sinfullnesse* of *Idolatry*. And if their hearts were so *blinded* with the *loue* of the *Creatures*, as not to *know any harm at all in giuing them diuine honour*, yet this hinders not but that there was *harm* in it, and that it was *sinfull* in its own *nature* antecedently to the *Law*, as *Concupiscence* was, although the *Apostle* saith he

knew it not to be ſin, but by the Law. Here then it was that the Dr. should haue laid *the Axe to the Root*, and added a 7th Chapter to show wherein the *de-ordination* or *ſinfulneſſ* of *Idolatry* conſiſts *antecedently* to any Poſitive *Prohibition*; and till *this* be done, you muſt giue me leaue to ſay of the *other ſix*, what *Virgil* ſaid of the *walls* of *Carthage*, when left *vnfinished.*

Pendent opera interrupta, minaque.

Murorum Ingentes. Twas *neceſſary* for him to haue ſetled the *notion* of *Idolatry* in the *nature* of the *thing*; and not after a mighty *Bravado*, as if he meant nothing leſſ than to do it, to *divert* and *amuze* his Reader with a tedious diſcourſe of *External Acts* of *worship*, as ſtanding vnder a Poſitiue *Prohibition*, though to the vtter ruin of the *aid* he propoſed to his cauſe from the *Paralel* he draws from the ſuppoſed *practice* of the *Heathens*, who *were not under the Law*, and therefore if they were *Idolaters*, it muſt be vpon ſome *other* account abſtracting from the Law. But this it is to be a *Dragon* at *Controverſy*.

Cathar: Yet when all is done, *Eunomius*, you muſt giue me leaue to tell

you, that the *ſecureſt way* to ſettle the *Notion* of *Idolatry*, muſt be from ſuch a *Prohibition*. For, abſtracting from *that*, in comes the *diſtinction* of *Abſolute* and *Relative* Worship; and I do not ſee, but by vertue of *that*, if it be admitted, Men may *worship* the *ſun*, the *ſtarrs*, the *Earth*, or any other *creature*, with the *ſame* kind of *worship* that they doe an *Image*, and be no more guilty of *Idolatry* in the *one* than in the *other*. And in what will this differ from the *practice* of the *Heathens?*

Roman Idol. p. 313.

Eun: This is a *thing* frequently and mightily objected by Dr. St. and the *Conſequence*, as the world goes, ſeems not much *vnlike* to that of the *Improvement* of the *Speaking-Trumpet* fancied by a late *Virtuoſo*, as being made capable to carry the *voice*, if a *league* off. then *eight mile* about, if *eight mile* about, then round a *whole County*: If round a *whole County*, then why not from *one Nation* to *another*, there being no *ſtop* in Art? And *ſo there will need* ſaith he, but *one Paſſon to preach to a whole County*, *from the moſt Eminent place in it*; *and Princes may convers and treat without the great charge and*

trouble of Embaſſadors.

Cathar: This is a *Fancy* you haue met with in ſome Idle Poet or other; but nothing *ſuitable* to the preſent purpoſe, ſince *Art* may ſtretch *Nature* too farr, and render it *vnſerviceable* to its *deſigns*. But the *Conſequence* we ſpeak of is admitted very ſeriously by ſome of the *Roman Divines*; and *Vaſques* in particular, *a man of a ſearching wit, not only grants but contends for it in a ſet diſputation, wherein he proues very well from the Principles of worship allowed in the Roman Church, that God may be adored in any other Beings, Rational or Irrational, as well as in an Image; provided the mind do not reſt in the Creature, but be terminated vpon God.*

Eun: For the *Fancy* as you call it, it matters not much *where* I had it: T'is the *Conformity* we are to mind between *it*, and the *Extenſion* you vrge of the *worship* giuen to an *Image*, to any other *creature*. For what euer the *conſequence* of this *latter* may be as to *Speculation*, yet for the *Practicableneſſe* of it, I think, as matters now ſtand with mankind after the fall of *Adam*, it will find as great

a *ſtop* in *nature*, as the *Speaking Trumpet*; the *creatures* euer ſince *Senſe* prevailed againſt *reaſon*, being become like *ſtumbling-blocks to the ſouls of men, and a ſnare to the feet of the vnwiſe*, to allure and draw them to the worship of *them*. And therefore thoſe very *Diuines* of the *Church* of *Rome*, who admit the *Conſequence* in *ſpeculation*, and do not *condemn* the *Practice* of *it* in *Philoſophical* and *Contemplatiue* men, who conſider the *Creatures* purely as the *works* of *God*, and as it were behold *him* preſent in *them*; do notwithſtanding vtterly *condemn* the *common* and *promiſcuous vſe* of it in the *Vulgar*, as expoſing them to *manifeſt danger* of being *ſeduced* by the tempting *beauty* and aſtoniſhing *power* of the *Creatures* to *forget* the *Creator*, and worship *them*. And that this was the caſe of the *Heathens*, at leaſt the *Generality* of them, is expreſly aſſerted by *Voſſius* in his *firſt Preface*, Where he ſaith that *the Gentils did not diſtinguish the Diuine Power, which is from God, from that other which is in God, and therefore from the wonderful things of nature, concluded nature it ſelf to be God, and the parts of it alſo to be deities*. And *this*

Voſſ. de Idol. Præf. 1.

he affirmeth to be *one of the reasons* which mov'd him to lay open the admirable *vertue* and *power* of the *Creatures* in a Treatise of *Idolatry*, *that we may know* saith he, *what compelled the Gentils to forsake God, and stay in the worship of Nature.* This is the account which *Vossius* giues of the *practice* of the *Heathens* (*vt relicto Deo in naturæ veneratione consisterent*) and it is no other than that which the *Scripture* and the *Fathers* giue of it, as I could shew at large, if need were. As for the supposed *Practice* of the *Wiser Heathens*, I haue shown the *Arguments* which the Dr. draws from thence to *support* his *charge*, to be *insignificant* and *vseless*, both in *this* and the 4th Dialogue. Part. 1. p. 114. 115.

Cathar: This *defence* of yours, though brought in with a *speaking-Trumpet* comes at last I see to be the *same* in substance with that of T. G. viz, that *the Creatures subsisting in them selues, and being evidently the causes of many great Benefits to mankind, the danger is greater of terminating worship vpon them, than vpon an Image, whose formal Being consisting only in representation connaturally carries our thoughts and Affections to the* Cath. no Idol. p. 93.

Person represented by it: And the *danger* is so much the *greater*, in that the *Creatures*, he saith, *represent God rudely, remotely, darkly, and imperfectly*. An excellent *Paraphrase* no doubt, as Dr. St. observes, *on the words of the Psalmist. The Heavens declare the Glory of God, and the Firmament sheweth his handy-worke. O how much the skill of a Painter exceeds the Power of God?*

Def. p. 805.

Eun: This was a *nicking* remark indeed, and not to be omitted. But then you are to consider that T. G. speaks there of the *Creatures* comparatively to *Images*, viz that though they carry in them the *marks* and *tokens* of an *Infinite Wisdom, Power*, and *Goodness*, yet they are not so apparently *representative* of *God*, that vpon the *sight* of them, our *thoughts* are *presently* and *effectually* carried to *him*, as they are vpon the *sight* of an *Image* to the Person *represented* by it, but that there is need of a great deal of *discourse* to discouer the *Analogy* they bear to the *Creator*, and the *dependance* they haue of *him* for their very *Being*, yet so that from the *greatness* and *beauty* of the *Creatures*, *the Maker of them may proportionably be seen*.

And

And this, I hope, is *no incongruous Paraphraſe* of the words of the Pſalmiſt, *The Heavens declare the Glory of God, and the Firmament sheweth his handy-work.* If Dr. St. haue the *eye* of his *vnderſtanding* ſo *elevated* and *penetrating*, that vpon the *ſight* of *them*, his *mind* is as *preſently* and *effectually* carried to *God*, as from the ſight of an *Image* to the *Prototype*, I beliеue he is one of the moſt *admirable Perſons* in the *Meletetiques*, (as the ſame Author calls them) *in the whole world.*

Cathar. The *Meletetiques*? What *mean* you by that? ſome *new Science* invented of late by the *Vertuoſi*?

Eun. I mean the Excellent *Art of Reflexion and Meditation vpon the Creatures*: which as it is *vſed* by the *Vertuoſi* for the *benefit* of Mankind, or their own *Curioſity*, may go for a part of *natural Philoſophy*: But *applied* to *devotion*, in the manner it is by Dr. St. I take it to be *that* part of *Myſtical Theology*, which ſo *in-eſſences* the ſoul with *God*, as to make it *ſee great Evidences of his Power, and Wiſdome, and Goodneſſ in an Ant or a Fly, which may ſuggeſt venerable Apprehenſions of him to the* Rom. Idol. p. 69.

mind; when it can *see nothing in any Artificial Image* (though of God *Incarnate* dying for our sakes vpon the *Crosse*) *worthy admiration, but the skill of the Painter or Artificer; nor any thing that can warm or inflame ones devotion comparably to the Sun.* *Petrus Viretus* must doubtlesse haue been well advanc'd in this *Science*, when, as the *Lutherans* report of him he wrote, that *Christ Crucified was represented better by a Cow than by any Image either painted or graven.* And *Beza* yet more, when he profess'd that *from his heart he detested the Image of Christ crucified: as being an Image of the Cruelty of the Iews towards him, and therefore could not endure it.* What a *prescinding* faculty was *this*, to *see* in a *Crucifix* the *Cruelty* of the *Iews* to *detest* it, and not *see* the *loue* of a *dying* God to *admire* it? But euery one has not made so great a progresse in this kind of *Meletetiques*, as these men, or as the Dr himself has done. And yet I cannot but *wonder* how *He* comes to be so *Excellent* in it, while he affirms *the Creatures can giue no greater than Moral certainty of the Being of* God himself, which seems to me to be no such *great*

In Collo. Mompelgart.

Ibid.

Rat. Acc. p. 178. 286. &c.

Incentive to Devotion, if according to him it admit a *possibility* of being *otherwise*.

Cathar: yet I am sure He lays down this for one of *his Principles*, that *whatever God reveals to man is infallibly true, and may be certainly known to be his Will.* And again that *all supernatural Revelation must suppose* (not only the moral certainty, but) *the Truth of Natural Religion*: *for unless We be* saith he, *antecedently certain that there is a God, it is impossible to be certain that God hath revealed his Will to us.* *Rom. Idol. p. 560.*

Eun: I know very well the Dr. can *say* and *unsay* without retracting with as much Art and *Ease* as any man I ever read. But if you ask him, whether the *Creatures* afford any *such* Evidence of the *Existence* of a *deity*, as can *infallibly* convince it to be absolutely *true* and so *impossible to be false*! He will tell you, *The nature of the thing will not beare it*; and consequently for any thing He or *any* one according to him, can *certainly* know from the *Creatures*, *possibly* there may be *no such* thing as a *God*. A much rarer *Paraphrase* no doubt than T. Gs. was on the *same* words of

the *Pſalmiſt*, *The Heavens declare the Glory of God, and the Firmament ſheweth his handy-work.* And of thoſe other words alſo of S. *Paul*, *The Inviſible things of God, even his Eternal Power and Divinity, are clearly ſeen, being underſtood by the things that are made.* O how much a *reſolute perſwaſion* that there is a *God*, notwithſtanding a *known Poſſibility* of *Falſhood*, exceeds the *Certainty* of a *Demonſtration*, to *raiſe* and *warm* one's *devotion* towards him! *T'was* for *this* I ſuppoſe that Dr. St. repreſents the *Heathens* (who neither *had* nor *could* haue according to him any *Infallible certainty* of the *Being* of *God*) ſo *piouſly wary* not to let their worſhip *ſtay* in the *Creatures*, but to *transferr* it to *God*; and *Chriſtians* who profeſſ to haue *ſuch certainty* of his *Being* from the *works* of the *Creation*, ſo *inconſiderately apt* to *terminate* their worſhip vpon an *Image*. If this *admirable way* of *inflaming* Affections be well *improu'd*, who knows but *Ignorance* at length may come indeed to be the *Mother of devotion*. But to *return* from whence you haue made me *digreſſ*, if I haue not forgotten it.

Cathar: I shall giue you time to *call* vpon yout *memory* till to morrow. For I muſt now go to another *meeting*.

Eun: But I pray do not you in the mean time *forget* that whilſt the Dr. giues us no other *Notion* of *Idolatry* than that of *External* Acts of *worship* ſtanding under a poſitive *Prohibition*, he cannot make the *Heathens* to be *Idolaters*, at leaſt before the *Law* was *giuen*; and ſo *ruins* the great *ſupport* of his *cauſe* from their *practice*. And if *They* were *Idolaters* without the *Law*, as S. *Paul* ſaith they were, he hath *failed* to giue us the *true* and *proper Notion* of *Idolatry*; which was the *firſt thing* I ſaid was *neceſſary* for him to haue done. The ſecond now comes to my mind, but I ſhall *reſerve it* for to morrow.

THE THIRD DIALOGVE.

THE ARGUMENT.

THe Second Thing Dr. S^r. ought to haue done, to maintain his Charge of Idolatry, in the worship of Images, was to shew the doctrine of the Church of Rome in her Councils to be Idolatrous. The doctrine of the Second Council of Nice in that Point, as stated by himself, not Idolatrous; and the Practice of bowing to the Altar, according to his Principles, flat Idolatry. An Instance of his reporting; faithfully *the Authorities he alledges, laid open in a passage cited by him out of Cardinal Lugo.*

CATHARINVS, EVNOMIVS.

EVnom. The *Second* Thing I iudg'd *neceſſary* for the Dr. to haue done was after he had ſetled the *true Notion*

of *Idolatry*, to shew how it *agreed* to the *doctrine* of the *Church* of *Rome* in her *Councils*; since t'is from *them* we are to *take* the *terms* of *Communion* with *her*.

Cathar: And I *wonder* yet more, how you should think him *defective* in this, when he hath treated so largely of the *doctrine* both of that *Wise Synod* of *Nice*, and of that *wary Council* of *Trent*, as he calls them.

Eun: And what is it *He* finds in their *Decrees* that he can fix the *notion* of *Idolatry* vpon, without returning it vpon *himself*, and the *Church* of *England*? And first for the *Council* of *Nice*. The *doctrine* of that *Council* concerning the *Images* of *Christ* and the *Saints* was no more, but that a *honourary adoration* be given them, *like* as is giuen to the Figure of the *Holy Crosse*, to *Chalices*, to the *Books* of the *Gospels* and such like *sacred* Vtensils. This was the *doctrine* of the *Council* of *Nice*: and how *it* is *freed* in this from the note of *Idolatry* by Eminent *Divines* of the *Church* of *England*, you haue heard before in our *first* Conference. What the Dr. himself saith of *it* in his *Defence* is. 1. that the

p. 575. *Council* required *true* and *real* worship to be giuen to *Images*. 2. that it was an *Inferiour worship*, and not *Latria*. And ſuppoſing this to be as he would haue it, can any thing be *clearer*, than that the *worship* or *reſpect* which the *Council* required to be given to *Images*, was *not* the Worship due to *God*, and conſequently the *Church* of *Rome* not chargeable with *Idolatry* for any thing contained in *that decree*.

Def. p. 600.601. *Cathar*: But ſtill the *worship*, ſaith he, *required is higher than meer Reverence, due to Holy places and things*; which is but a *different vſage and regard from other things, as the Veſſels of the Church, or the Chalices are not to be vſed for common drinking*. And is there no difference think you between *a Religious reſpect (if I may ſo call it) to ſacred places and things; and all the moſt ſolemn Acts* p. 603. *of* Adoration, *which were euer giuen to Images by the groſſeſt and moſt ſottiſh Idolaters; ſuch as kneelings before them, proſtrations, praying with their eyes fixed vpon them, as though they were ſpeaking to them, burning Incenſe and lights before them?*

Euan: If Dr. St. will be ſo *liberal* as to giue

giue *it* the title of *Religious respect to Holy Places and Things*, t'is more than *those* of the *Church* of *Rome* are *bound* to do by the *terms* of *Communion* with *her*; for there is *no* such Expression in the *Decrees* of her *Councils*. But then again, if the *degree* of *respect* or *honour* to be shewed to them, be only a *different vsage and regard from other things, as that the Vessels of the Church, or Chalices are not to be vsed for common drinking*, what means the *Church* of *England* by *bowing* before the *Altar*? Is not the *Altar* sufficiently *garded* by being set with in *Rails*, and *regard* sufficiently shewd to *it* by keeping it *clean*, and decently *couered*, and not permitting *it* to be *vsed* for *common eating*? Why then must the *Ministers* bow down before it, as often as they goe in and out of the *Chancel*, which if the *Altar* had any *sense would think were done to it*? as I haue for certain been informed of a Countrey-fellow (something of kin as I suppose to him, who found out the brave *Covie* of one Partridge) who being got neer the *Altar* in his Maties Chappel thought all the Congies had been made to him, and so as in Courtship bound

fell to making of legs after his Fashion to answer the great Civilities that were done him. On the other side, If the *Church* of *England* mean by *this* Action to shew, what the Dr. saith may be called a *Religious respect*, to the *Altar*; on the account of its being *Sacred* to *God*, why may not the *Church* of *Rome* do the *same* to the *Images* of *Christ* and the *Saints*? And if *Bowing*, which is an *Act appropriated to God* (and reckoned as such by Dr. St. himself together with *consecrating*, *kneeling*, &c. p. 861.) may be used for *that* end, why not *kneeling*, or *prostration*, or *fixing of eyes* in time of prayer, or *burning Incense*, or *lights*? What makes the *discrimination* between these *Acts*, if they be *all* appropriated to *God*? And if there be *none* made, and any of *them* may be *used*, is not the *Church* at liberty to determine *which* or *how many* of them she will make *use* of? However *Those* of the *Church* of *Rome* to purge themselues from *Idolatry* in *bowing* &c. before the *Images* of *Christ* and the *Saints* may pretend that they *intend* not to giue to them, the *honour* due to *God*; and *those* of the *Church* of *England*, that

they *intend* not to *exhibite any Religious worship to the Communion-Table*; yet I ſee not how Dr. St. can purge *himſelf* or the *Church* of *England* (if it be *his*) from that *crime*, when he aſſerts, that *any Image being made ſo farr the Obiect of Divine worship, that Men do bow down before it* (and I ſuppoſe the *ſame* holds with him for any other *creature*) *it doth thereby become an Idol, and on that account is forbidden in the* 2d *Commandment.*

Cathar: But this Act of *Bowing* is not vſed in the *Church* of *England*, as Dr. St. ſaith, *with any ſubmiſſion of the mind towards the Altar*; as it *is* in the *Church* of *Rome* towards *Images*; And *herein* I conceive he makes the main *point* of the *difference* to conſiſt. *Def. p. 86. 865.*

Eun: This is to give a *new turn* to the Buſineſſ. For by this it ſhould ſeem, that *t'is not* now the doing an *External act* appropriated to *God*, to the *Altar*, or an *Image*, which makes it *Idolatry*, but the *intention of the mind* with which it is done: And ſo the Dr. muſt *renounce* his *old notion* of *Idolatry*, and *giue* us a *new* one. But where does he read in the *Decree* of the *Council*, that *it* requires

ſubmiſſion of mind to the *Images* themſelues? What the *Council* requires is that the Faithful *ſalute* them, and *exhibite* (*honorariam Adorationem*) a certain *worship* of *honour* to them; and whether you will call it *Salutation* or *Adoration*, *Epiphanius* there declares it will be the *ſame* thing, ſo doth the Patriarch *Taraſius* alſo (*Ep. ad Imperator.*) when he ſaith, that *the Adoration here* meant is *no* other than a *ſaluting*, or if you had rather call it ſo, *Embracing* of *them*. And accordingly the *Anathema* at the end of the *Council* runs thus; *Si quis non ſalutaverit*, if any one ſhall *not ſalute* in the name of our *Lord* and his *Saints* their ſacred *Images*, &c.

Cathar: Here I confeſſ the Fathers of *that* Council showed themſelues *wary* as well as *Wiſe*: Notwithanding it is the *Judgment* of many of the moſt *learned* and *Eminent Divines* of the *Roman Church*, that by the *Decree* of the *Nicene* Council *ſuch true and real worship is to be giuen to Images, as is terminated vpon the Images themſelues*. And amongſt the reſt *Cardinal Lugo* ſaith, that *to the worship of Images, it is not only neceſſary, that the External Act be performed to*

Def. p. 592

the Image, viz. of kiſſing or bowing &c. but there muſt be an inward Affection too which implyes ſubmiſſion. For, ſaith he, *worship, as all agree, is an Expreſſion of ſubmiſſion to the thing worshipped. And it would be ridiculous to ſay that Peter is worshipped by that token of ſubmiſſion which I ſhew to Paul. Therefore to the worship of the Image, the outward Act muſt expreſſ the inward ſubmiſſion of the mind to it; or elſe we muſt deny the Common definition of Adoration, and make a new one.* And this he afterwards proues to haue been the definition of the Second *Council* of *Nice*, *who did decree that true and real worship is to be giuen to Images, as they are diſtinct from the Exemplar according euery thing that is required to the nature of worship.*

Eun: ſuppoſing *this* to be as Dr. St. *repreſents*, it is but the *Ratiocination* of a *Diuine*, endeauouring to ſhew his *Opinion* conformable to the words of the *Council*. But what if the Dr. haue *ſtrained* the *words* and *ſenſe* of the *Cardinal* beyond, and *beſides*, if not *againſt* his meaning? T is none of the *laudable* vertues of a *Contreuertiſt* to do ſo; yet being a thing ſo frequently in *uſe* among

them, I could not hauing the Book by me, but *indulge* ſo farr to my *Curioſity*, as to look into the place cited by the Dr. viz *de myſt, Incarn. diſp. 36. ſect. 3. n. 37.* And firſt I found a ſtrange want of *exactneſſ* as to the *words*: for what the *Cardinal* there ſaith is this.

3. *Ponendum eſt, non ita ferri ad imaginem ſolum actum externum oſculi aut genuflexionis &c. ut non feratur etiam ad illam aliquis affectus internus, qui etiam poteſt dici affectus aliquis ſummiſſionis.* That is, in the third place it is to be ſuppoſed, that *the ſole external Act of kiſſing or bowing &c. is not ſo carried to the Image, that ſome inward affection* (aliquis internus affectus, mark that) *is not alſo carried to it, which may be alſo called* (poteſt dici, mark that alſo) *ſome, or a certain kind* (affectus aliquis) *of ſubmiſſion.* Now comes Dr. St. and tells us very roundly that *Cardinal Lugo* ſaith, that *to the worship of Images, it is not only neceſſary, that the External Act be performed to the Image, of kiſſing or bowing &c. but there muſt be an inward affection which implies ſubmiſſion.* Where, (not to quarrel the words *neceſſary* and *muſt* put into the Text,) I

noted that *those* qualifying or diminishing *expreſsions* of *aliquis* and *poteſt dici*, were *left out* by the Dr. and the *Senſe* by ſo doing rendred *Abſolute*? This I liked ſo much the *worſe*, for that he had *prepared* his Reader before hand to entertain this conceit of it, by telling him that *Cardinal Lugo* ſaith of the word *cultus*, that *in approued Authors he finds it alwaies applied to ſignify Reuerence towards Superiours*; which ioined to the *other words*, as translated by him, muſt needs breed an *Impreſsion* in the Reader, that the inward affection the *Cardinal* required, was of giving *ſubmiſsion* to an *Image* as *Superior*. This excited me to look into the *two* foregoing *Poſitions*, laid down by the *Cardinal*: where I found the *firſt* (which he aſſerts *as moſt certain*) to be, that *when we worship an Image, the inward affection is not carried to the Image, after the ſame manner it is to the Prototype. For we worship*, ſaith he, *the Prototype abſolutely, that is, for it's own proper Excellency; but the Image only with a Relative worship*, cultu ſolum reſpectivo, that is *for the Excellency, not of the Image it ſelf, but of the Prototype*, Def. p. 186.

which kind of worship (cultus) he affirms to be *farr Inferiour to that other, which is Absolute.* Again *we worship the Prototype*, saith he, *as that to which we owe that worship, and to which we pay it as a debt, and in order to which it is an act of Justice. But we do not worship the Image so, but as the term of that worship which we owe to another, that is, the Prototype.*

His 2d *Position* is, that *we haue not the same inward submission towards the Image, which we haue towards the Prototype. For we submit our selues to the Prototype, acknowledging it to be more excellent than ourselues, and superior to us; which kind of submision we cannot prudently conceiue to belong to an Image, nor indeed any at all, by which we submit our selues to it, preferring it before us. For this would be a foolish lye &c. No man therefore can say that the worship of an Image includes such an Internal submission, nor can there be in reason any Controversy about it.*

Hauing laid down these *two* Positions n. 35. 36. so directly contrary to the *Impression* which Dr. St. had giuen his Reader by his *dexterity* in the *Art* of

reporting faithfully, (as he promiſed) the *words* and *ſenſe* of the Authors cited by him, he immediately adds in the 3d place, *n.* 37. the paſſage alledged by the Dr. viz that *the ſole external act of kiſſing or bowing, is not ſo carried to the Image, but that ſome inward affection alſo goes along with it, which he ſaith may be called alſo* (aliquis affectus) *ſome kind of affection of ſubmiſſion.* Here vpon I was drawn yet farther to ſeek what *kind* of *ſubmiſſion* this was, and *n.* 39. I found him to mean by it an *affection* of *ſubmitting our ſelues outwardly to the Image: for as much as the act of the will from which it proceeds is an affection of performing thoſe acts about their Images, which we are wont to exerciſe towards our ſuperiors.* And then declares himſelf farther in theſe words. *I truly yeild*, ſaith he, *in point of external honour to an Image, giuing it a better and higher place, treating it honorably, and the like; but this which I do exteriourly, I do not only interiourly will, but intend alſo to ſignify that I haue an intention of performing all theſe things, for the word Adoro, or I worſhip, ſignifies* ſaith he, *this affection of the mind towards Holy*

Images; Therefore I signify some inward purpose of yeilding and submitting my self as to my outward deportment, to the Image. And this very purpose or affection is that saith he *which we call Internall submission. For we intend neither to say, that we esteem it interiorly to be more perfect than our selues, or that it is superior to us, nor to haue any dominion ouer us, for which we ought to serue it. Who can say this? But only that we haue interiourly an intention of performing outwardly towards an Image for the excellency of the Prototype who is represented by it, those acts of external submission, which we are wont to perform towards those who are more excellent, and haue dominion ouer us; because all this honour is due to the Prototype also in his Image, which in reality,* saith he, *Sect. 4. n. 49. is no other than to say, that the Prototype in it self deserues to be treated honourably, not only in it self, but in all things which haue connexion with it, as its Image or Garment or the like.* This is the *Explication* the *Cardinal* himself giues, of what he saith may be called *affectus aliquis submissionis*, some *kind* of *affection* of *submission*.

And now I pray conſider what a *different* face of things here is, from what they were *repreſented* by Dr. St. and how farr the *Cardinal* is from acknowledging *any ſubmiſsion* of *mind* to an *Image*, as *Superior*, which is the *Impreſsion* the Dr. gaue his Reader by foreſtalling his Judgment, with thoſe other words of the *Cardinal*, viz, that *he had found the word worship in approued Authors to be alwaies applied to ſignify Reuerence towards Superiors*, which may be done, by performing *externall acts* of honour to *them* either in *themſelues*, or in ſuch *things* as haue *connexion* with *them*: and then endeauouring to fix it deeper by *leauing* out in the paſſage tranſlated by him, the words *Aliquis*, and *poteſt dici*, vſed on purpoſe by the *Cardinal* to qualify the term *ſubmiſsion*, as applicable to an *Image* in the *manner* you haue heard. Had T. G. whom the Dr. calls *a man of Tricks*, play'd ſuch a *trick* of *leger demain* as this, what ſad complaints ſhould we haue had of his want of *Candour* and *Sincerity*? What hearty *wishes* of his *fair-dealing* and *Ingenuity*? And after all, what a *Thundershower full of Sul-*

phur, and Nitre and darkneſſ with a terrible Crack to his *credit* neuer to be repaired? What think you of this *Catharinus*?

Cathar: I cannot ſay, that this was very *fairly* done, if it be as *you* ſay; And I think if men will *cite* Authors, they ought to do it in their own *words*, at leaſt according to their own *meaning*: Or elſe to what *purpoſe* is it done?

Enn: To a great deal of *purpoſe* I can aſſure you. For firſt, it ſerves to breed a high *conceit* of the *learning* and *knowledge* of the Alledger, eſpecially if the *Citations* be *many* and *long*, and out of Authors of *all Nations*, and *all languages*, and *all ages*, and *all Religions*. 2dly It ſerues to *captivate* the aſſent of *partial* Readers, and to *ſuſpend* at leaſt the *Judgment* of ſuch as are *Impartial*, till they haue examined the *Teſtimonies*, which in all likelyhood will be neuer. 3dly It ſerues to engage the *Reſpondent* (if he haue no more *wit*) to write a *Volume* in anſwer to them, as bigg as a *Church-Bible*, or *Foxe's Acts and Monuments*, if any conſiderable part of them ſhould chance to be *like*

this out of *Cardinal Lugo*: and ſo the *Book* to be look'd vpon as *not anſwered*, till that be done.

Cathar. Not ſo neither, *Eunomius*, as you put the caſe. But if *four* of *five* of them be diſcovered to be *faulty*, it will ſerue to *crack* the *credit*, as you ſay, of *all* the reſt.

Eun: This poſſibly may come to be the *Reſult* after a litle time; For I durſt my ſelf undertake to shew *half a ſcore* conſiderable faults of this *nature*, in that firſt *glorious* Chapter of the Drs. Defence wherein he cites ſo many *Authors* both *ancient* and *Modern*, to proue *the Heathens Jupiter to be the one true Supream God*, and make *their* worship and *that* of the *Arians* paralel to that of the *Church* of *Rome*. And now becauſe the *Arians* are come in my way, in whoſe *aid* the Dr. places ſo great *confidence*, I shall giue you *another inſtance* of his *ſincerity* in their very caſe, both to confirm what I haue advanced with a *double witneſſ* and to let you ſee the *vanity* of the Drs. *Argument* from the practice of the *Arians*.

Cathar. This I should be *ſorry* to hear for the Drs. and the *Cauſe's* ſake. But

for this of *Cardinal Lugo* though there be *ſtretching* in the caſe, yet I cannot believe it was done out of *deſign*: And after all, I ſee very well, that he requires *ſome inward affection of ſubmiſſion to an Image*, which is ſufficient in the preſent caſe to make the *difference* wide enough between *him* and the *Dr.*

Eun: The *Cardinal* ſaith it may be *called ſo*, in regard the *External Act* of *bowing* proceeds, as he ſaith, from an *Intention* to deferr to the *Image an external honour* not for it's ſelf, but for the *Prototype's* ſake; but yet in reality, he ſaith, it *amounts* to no more, but *that the Prototype by reaſon of it's Excellency deſerues to be treated honourably not only in its ſelf, but in all things which haue connexion with it, as an Image or the like.* And if this be the *Senſe* of the *Council*, as the *Cardinal* endeauours to proue, however Dr. St.' may *quarrel* with him about the words, viz, whether it may be called *a certain kind of Affection of ſubmiſſion* to the *Image*, or no? yet I do not ſee but he perfectly *agrees* with him in the thing: when he affirms, that *although no irrational or inanimate Being be capable of that real Excellency to*

Def. p. 600. 601

deſerue any honour from us for it's own ſake (as *Aquinas*, ſaith he, *determines*, and he might haue ſaid, *Cardinal Lugo* too) *yet ſuch things* ſaith he, *may haue a Relation to matters of ſo high a nature, as to deſerue a different uſage and regard from other things*: which is I ſuppoſe what he afterwards means by *the Reverence* he ſaith *there is left to be shewed to ſacred Places*, and with an (*if I may ſo call it*, iuſt like the Cardinal) *a Religious reſpect to ſacred Places and Things*. For if *theſe things*, vpon account of the *Relation* they haue to ſome thing of an *higher* nature, deſerue *Reverence* and *Reſpect* from us, there muſt be *ſome Intention of the mind to expreſſ it towards them*, as is granted by the Dr. himſelf. p. 862. And if the *outward Act* to be giuen, be of *Bowing* which is a *Token or Expreſſion of ſubmiſſion*, there muſt be a proportionable *Affection* of the *mind* to perform it, for example, towards the *Altar*. Otherwiſe the *outward Act* will be *falſe* and *Hypocrytical*, and no more *honour* will be done to the *Altar*, than to *another* Table by *kneeling* before it. Whether the Dr. will think fit to call this *inward* Act of

p. 862.

p. 603.

the mind, *affectus aliquis ſubmiſſionis*, as the *Cardinal* thinks it may be called, (*poteſt dici*) I ſhould adviſe *him* to diſpute it with him, but that he profeſſes ſo ſincerely, *he loues not to wrangle about words.* But whilſt he *bows* towards the *Altar* with intention to ſhow *that Reverence* and *Reſpect*, which *it* deſerues for the Relation it hath to God, he doth in reality *all* that to the *Altar*, which the *Cardinal* requires to be done to an *Image*. So that if the *one* be *Idolatry*, the *other* muſt be ſo too; and if either be more than other, the *diſadvantage* is on the Dr's ſide, at leaſt as to the *manner* of Expreſſion; Firſt, becauſe the *Cardinal* places the *deſert* for which this *external* deference is performed towards an *Image*, in the *Prototype*; *This*, ſaith he, *in reality is no more than to ſay, that the Prototype deſerues to be treated honourably, not only in it ſelf, but in all things which haue connexion with it:* But Dr. St. places it in the *things* themſelues, which he ſaith *may deſerue to haue ſuch Reverence expreſſed to them for the Relation they haue to God.* 2dly Becauſe the *Cardinal* makes the *ſame* Reverence in

Sect. 5. n. 62.

ſubſtance,

ſubſtance, which is terminated on the *Prototype* to fall after an *Inferior* manner on the *Image* for his ſake. But Dr. St. will haue the *Reverence* ſhown to ſacred *Places* and *things*, (for example to the *Altar*) together with the *Intention to expreſſ ſuch outward Reverence to them* on the account of their being *ſacred* to *God*, to be *diſtinct* from the *Reverence* that is due to *God*: which is the *very* thing, *Vaſquez* charges with *Idolatry*, if the *Reverence* ſhewn be a *token* or *Expreſſion* of *ſubmiſſion*, as *Bowing* is: ſo hard a thing is it for him to meddle with *thoſe ſharp-edged Tools*, call'd *ſchool-diſtinctions*, without hazarding to *cut* ſome thing more than his own *fingers* with them, I mean the very *throat* of his *cauſe*. *Def. p. 861. 862.*

Cathar: This I ſuppoſe was the *Reaſon* why my Friend the *Patron Bonæ Fidei*, ſaid of him, that *he had endeauoured to dawb and ſmooth ouer this kind of Adoration*, but *levi brachio*, as he expreſſes it.

Eun: And in that I think he had *reaſon*: For he that can ſee the *difference* between *bowing* towards an *Image* as maintained by the *Cardinal*, and *bowing*

towards the *Altar* as defended by Dr. St. except in words, muſt haue his *ſight ſharp* enough to diſcern *Inviſibles*: As he on the other ſide muſt haue *little* or *none* left him, that cannot ſee the *difference* between the *practice* of the Arrians, towards *Chriſt*, and that of the *Church* of Rome towards the *Saints*.

Cathar: This puts me in mind of the *other Inſtance* you promiſed, to confirm what you had ſaid of the Dr's *miſrepreſenting the Authors* he cites. And I pray what was it?

Eun: Theſe are ſome months paſt, ſince I took *notice* of it: But I will *look* it out againſt our next meeting. In the mean time you may *ruminate* vpon his kind *uſage* of the *Cardinal*.

Cath. It hath made too great an *Impreſsion* vpon me to be eaſily *forgotten*.

THE FOVRTH DIALOGVE.

THE ARGUMENT.

ANother Instance of Dr. Sts. reporting faithfully, *shown in a passage he cites out of S. Gregory Nyssen in the case of the Arians. The doctrine of the same S. Gregory concerning an Inferiour Respect due to the Saints, and their Reliques. The Argument the Dr. brings from the practice of the Arians, shown to be Incongruous, and manifestly different from that of Roman-Catholicks towards Saints and Images. His Excellent Defence of a Testimony out of Arnobius formerly mis-represented by him: and Subtil Observations upon the doctrine of the Council of Trent in the matter of Images. The Remedies devised by him for avoiding Idolatry in the worship of Images, equally applicable to Bowing to the Altar, or the Chair of state.*

CATHARINVS, EVNOMIVS.

CAthar. Well, *Eunomius*, haue you found the other *Inſtance* you promiſed to giue me in the caſe of the *Arians*, of the Drs. *miſ-repreſenting* (as you call *it*) the *Authors* he cites?

Eun: I haue, and *it* is *this*. Among other *Teſtimonies* brought by him with a greal deal of *Pomp* to shew that the *Arians* were charged with *Idolatry* for the *worſhip* they gaue to Chriſt, whom *They* acknowledged to be a *Creature*, from thence to *paralel* their worship with *that* of the *Church* of *Rome* to the *Saints*, he cites the words of *S. Greg. Nyſſen Orat. de laudibus Baſilij*, viz, *that the Deuil by the means of Arianiſm brought Idolatry again inſenſibly into the world, perſuading men to return to the worship of the creature by his ſophiſtry, and that Arius, Eunomius, Eudoxius, and Aerius were his inſtruments in reſtoring Idolatry under a pretence of Chriſtianity*. This is *what* he tells us that *Father* ſaid, and as to the *general* truly enough. But was there no more *requiſite* to be done in

Def. p 170.

the caſe? Doth not *S. Greg.* tell us in that very place, what *kind* of worſhip it was, which the *Arians* gaue to *Chriſt*, and for which he charges them with *Idolatry*? yes he does. And his words are theſe, viz, *that the deuil under a pretence of Chriſtianity brought Idolatry again inſenſibly into the world, perſuading men*, ſaith he, *not to recede from the Creature, but to adore and worſhip it, and think a creature to be God hauing giuen it the name of the Son; and although it were of a different nature from God, not to regard that, but placing the name of Chriſt vpon a Creature, to worſhip and ſerue it, and alſo to fix hopes of ſalvation in it, and expect Judgment from* it. Thus doth S. Greg. lay forth the *nature* of the *worſhip* which the *Arians* gaue to *Chriſt*. And then come in theſe other words, viz, that *Arius, Eudoxius and the reſt were the Devil's Inſtruments in the reſtoring Idolatry*. And now I pray tell me, was it not *neatly* done of the Dr. to *wrap* vp *all* this in thoſe *ſhort* words. *The deuil perſwaded men to return to the worſhip of the Creature*? Had he made uſe of this kind of *Laconiſm* in thoſe frequent *Amplifications*,

where he dilates himſelf *uſque ad nauſeam* in things *Indifferent*, and I may ſay, *Impertinent* to the *Queſtion*, it had been a great *Eaſe* to his Reader, and no *Prejudice* to his cauſe. But here to *ſuppreſſ* the *nature* of the worship giuen by the *Arians* to *Chriſt*, from whence the *Paralel* was to be made with *that* which the *Church* of *Rome* allows to the *Saints* was but to caſt a *miſt* before his Readers eyes with that *General*, (and as Mr. *Thorndike* calls it) *equivocal term* of *worship to a Creature*. But then again the ſetting down the words, *as they* are in S. *Gregory*, would haue been a great *prejudice* to his Cauſe indeed, becauſe the world would haue clearly ſeen, how *different* the worship, which the *Church* of *Rome* giues to the *Saints*, is from *that* which the *Arians* gaue to *Chriſt*, acknowledging *him* to be a *Creature*. For thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome* publickly *profeſſ* that they look not vpon the *Saints* as *Gods*, but as the *Seruants* of *God*; nor as *Mediators* of *Redemption*, in whom they put the *Truſt* of their *Salvation*, and from whom they expect the *final reward* of their labours; not *worship* and *ſerue* them with *Latria*, as

the *Arians* did the *Son*, though they beliewed *him* to be a *Creature*; but that they humbly *begg* the prayers of those *Just* persons, which they know to be *available* with *God*, as a *means* to obtain these and other *benefits* from *him* (the sole *Author* of them) by his *Son our Lord Jesus Christ*, whom they acknowledge to be their *only Redeemer* and *Saviour*. What the Dr. *obiects* concerning the Phrase *suppliciter invocare* used by the *Council* of *Trent* is so *frivolous* and *school-boy-like*, (not to say *childish*, as he does to T. G.) that a *man* must haue very *litle* to do to set his *wit* against it. Euery *child* knows how to begg his *Father's* prayers in a *suppliant* manner without making him a *God*. And for that farther *Obiection*, which, he saith, *puts the matter out of dispute with all who do not wilfully blind themselues*, viz, that the *Council of Trent commends the making recourse not only to the Prayers of the Saints, but to their* Ayd *and* Assistance, this *pretious* Obiection had been quite *lost*, had he but set down the *end* for which their *ayd* and *assistance* is there required, viz, *ob beneficia impetranda a Deo per Fi-*

Def. p. 293.

p. 294.

lium ejus &c. For the obtaining benefits from God, (the word *impetrare* signifies to *obtain* by *requeſt*) *through his Son our Lord Ieſus Chriſt.* And if the Dr. will needs haue *ayd* and *aſsiſtance* to be taken *as diſtinct* from *prayers*; A *man doth, I ſuppoſe, anſwer the ſignification* of that *Phraſe* by deſiring the *Saints* to employ the *Fauour* they haue with *God*, as *Iuſt* Perſons, for the *obtaining* of *them* from *God*, without making recourſe to *them* as to the *Authors* of thoſe *Bleſsings*. He that cannot ſee
Def. p. 861. the *difference* of theſe things (as the Dr. ſaith elſe where) *hath ſome Cataracts before his eyes, which need couching*: And I know none fitter to make the *Operation* in the preſent Circumſtance, than the ſame S. *Gregory* in the *Oration* he made vpon the Great and Holy *Martyr S. Theodore*, which is not queſtioned euen by *Riuetus* himſelf that *Caprichious Fanatick* in *Criticiſm*, to be the *Genuine* work of that *Father*.

In the beginning of that *Oration* S. *Gregory* hauing commended his Auditors for their *deuotion* to the *Martyrs*, which he there calleth, καθαρὰν θεραπείαν a *pure worſhip*; and minded them,

them, from the *deliverance* they had received the year before from the fury of the Barbarous Scythians by that *Glorious* ſouldier of *Chriſt S. Theodore* (ut credimus, *as we believe*, ſaith he) to conſider *how great a thing a Iuſt man is, and how many rewards he is made wo thy of, even in the things of this world, and belonging to us*; He firſt deſcribes the *Magnificent Structure* of the *Temple*, with the great *concourſe* of people from other *Cities* and *Countries* to it, the curious *peices* of *Sculpture* that were in it in *wood*, *ſtone*, and *ſilver*: and aboue all the *Picture* of the *Martyr* in the ſeveral *Stages* of his combat, and *that* of *Chriſt* our *Lord* aſſiſting him in them drawn with ſuch exquiſite *Art*, that it cauſed both *delight* and *Benefit* in the *Spectators* to behold them. Then deſcending to the *Shrine*, where the *Body* of the *Martyr* was kept, he ſets forth the great eſteem the *Faithful* made of the very *duſt* of the Place, and the earneſt *deſire* they had to *touch* the *Sacred Reliques*, which, he ſaith, was deemed a *great Happineſs* for any to be permitted to do; And in caſe it were *obtained*, *They embrace*, ſaith he, *the Body as if*

they beheld it yet aliue, apply'ing it first to their eyes, mouth, eares, and other Instruments of sense; and then powring forth tears of duty and Affection vpon the Martyr, as if he were whole before them, sollicite his Supplication and Intercession, beseeching him as a Champion of God, and Invocating him, as one that could obtain Blessings, when he would, for them. After this, he dilates himself vpon the *valour* and *Constancy* of the *Martyr* in his *Confession* and *sufferings*, with his *consummation* and *passage* to *Heaven* by *Fire*. Then puts his *Auditors* again in mind of the great *benefits* received by him, in *convocating Assemblies, instructing the Church, driving away devils, bringing back the Angels of Peace, begging of God profitable things for them, and making the very place where his Body rested, a Store-house of Remedies for manifold diseases; a Harbour for those who are tost with the Tempest of Afflictions, a Plent full Treasury for the Poor, a quiet Receptable for Travellers, and a Glorious Station for such as meet to celebrate his Feast*, whom there he calls the *Ministers of his Honour*. Having thus *erected* and *inflamed*

their minds with *hope* of *Aid* and *Aſſiſtance* from the *Martyr* in their preſent *neceſſities*, he addreſſes himſelf to him at the end of the *Oration*, in theſe words. *We ſtand in need of many benefits, do Thou intercede and deprecate with our Common King and Lord for thy Country. We live in continual fear of dangers. The Cruel Scythians are not farr off ready to invade us. Do thou as a ſouldier fight in our defence, and as a Martyr ſpeak with freedome in behalf of thy fellow-ſervants. Though Thou haſt ouercome the world, yet thou knoweſt the Affections and neceſſities of our humane condition. Begg for Peace that theſe publick Aſſemblies be not interrupted by the Incurſion of the Barbarians. That we have been preſerved hitherto from their Fury; we acknowledge as a benefit received from thee. We deſire alſo ſecurity for the time to come. And in caſe there be need of greater Interceſſion, call an Aſſembly of thy Brother-Martyrs; Let the prayers of many Iuſt Perſons expiate the ſins of Multitudes of Offenders. Admoniſh Peter, excite Paul, and Iohn alſo the Beloued Diſciple, to be ſolicitous for the Churches they have founded, and*

for which they haue suffered Imprisonments and death; that Idolatry may not lift vp it's head; that Heresies like Thorns may not ouer grow the Vineyard, nor Tares choke vp the wheat &c. But by the vertue, (τῇ δυνάμει *by the power*) *of thine and thy Fellow's Intercession, O admirable Man, and Eminent among Martyrs, the Christian Church may be a plentiful Feild of Harvest, yeilding alwaies fruit of Euerlasting life conferred vpon us by our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom with the Father and the H. Ghost be Glory, dominion and Honour now and for euermore.*

Had Dr. St. been *present* at this *Oration* how may we think, would his *zeal* haue *vrged* him, to haue cry'd out *Idolatry, Flat Idolatry, very real Idolatry, meer Heathenish Idolatry*, and in all likelyhood to haue returned vpon *Gregory*, what *Gregory* had said in the *former* Testimony of *Arius* and the rest, that *he was the Devel's Instrument to bring back Idolatry into the world, perswading men to return to the worship of the Creature, by making recourse not only to the Prayers, but to the ayd and assistance of the Saints*; giving them *thanks*

for *benefits* receiued, and expecting *defence* and *Protection* from them for the *future*.

Cathar. And truly I think he would haue had *reason* enough to do so; For what the *wary Fathers* of the *Council* of *Trent* say, looks but like a peice of *Reformation* if *compared* with *this*.

Eun: And yet this is that very *Gregory*, who was *Brother* to the great *S. Basil*; a man *famous* for his *learning* and *Piety*, and on that account particularly *Reverenced* by S. *Gregory Nazianzen*, and *S. Hierom*. He liued in *that Age of the Church*, of which the Dr. himself in the *Epistle Dedicatory* to his Defence, saith, that *Idolatry was then suppressed by the Imperial Edicts, the Churches setled by Law under the Government of Bishops, Publick Liturgies appointed, Antiquity reverenced, Schism discountenanced, Learning encouraged, and some few Ceremonies used, but without any of those corrupt mixtures which afterwards prevailed in the Roman Church. The Bishops of that time were saith he men of that Exemplar Piety, of those great Abilities, of that excellent conduct and Magnani-*

mity, as ſet them aboue the contempt or reproach of any but Infidels and Apoſtates. For then, ſaith he, *liued the Gregories,* (of which ſurely *this* was *one*) *the Baſils, the Chryſoſtoms in the Eaſtern Church; the Ambroſes and Auguſtins in the Weſtern; and they who can ſuſpect theſe to haue been Enemies to the Power of Godlineſſ, did neuer vnderſtand what it meant.* I leaue the Doctor to *apply* his *own* words as he *pleaſes*. It is in his *choice*, whether he will put himſelf among the *Contemners* and *Reproachers*; or *acknowledge* the *veneration of Reliques* and *Inuocation* of *Saints* not to be *corruptions*. As for S. *Gregory* t'is manifeſt he both *called* vpon the *Martyrs for their ayd and aſſiſtance*, and *excited* the People to do *ſo*, not as a *new* thing, but what they had been *bred* to, without fear either of being *reproached* by thoſe other great *Lights* of that *Age*, who did the *ſame*, or of being *vnderſtood* by any (for Dr. St. was not *there*, nor *Vigilantius* neither as I ſuppoſe) to make the *Saints* themſelues the *Authors* of the *Benefits* they deſired; or to place *Hope* of *Saluation* in them, or expect the *reward* of *Eternal* life from *them*,

which is *what he* charged the *Arians* with in the other *Teſtimony*, to do towards *Chriſt*, whom they acknowledged to be a *Creature*. And Dr. St. by *ſuppreſſing* thoſe moſt *important* words, when he *cited* the paſſage hath giuen us another very *pregnant example* of his *reporting faithfully*; but ſo much the more *vnpardonable*, in that he had been *forewarned* of it by his *Adverſary* T. G. (*cath. no Idol. p.* 126.) where he ſhews the *Fathers* of the *Synod* of *Conſtantinople*, who alledged that very *paſſage* of *S. Gregory* againſt the *worship* of *Images*, to haue been charged by *Epiphanius* in the Second *Council* of *Nice* for *adulterating* the *words* and *meaning* of it, viz, for *putting the name of Chriſt for* that *of the Son; and whereas S. Gregory's diſcourſe there, was againſt the Arians, proving them to be Idolaters, becauſe they acknowledged Chriſt to be a Creature, and yet adored, ſerued, and put their Truſt in him, they wickedly perverted his words againſt the Images of Chriſt; which although Chriſtians retain in memory, and reuerence out of loue to him, who is repreſented by them, yet they neither call them Gods, nor ſerue them*

as Gods, nor at any time put their hope of Salvation in them, as the Arians did in the Son, though they believed him to be a Creature. Thus T. G out of *Epiphanius*, and then addes, that *the Dr. thought it not to his purpose to take notice of this Iuggle of his Constantinopolitan Fathers, in putting the name Christ for Son, least it might put his Reader in mind, of his own dexterous managing the words and sense of Authors cited by himself*; which any one would think might haue been a very *sufficient caution* to *him*, either not to haue *meddled* with this passage of *S. Gregory* at all, or to haue giuen it in it's *full words* and *meaning*. By *this* then, and the *former Instance* out of *Cardinal Lugo*, you may ghess in *part* (and the world in time may see more *fully*) what *Candour* and *Sincerity* is to be *expected* from *him* in his *Citations*, especially at such time as the *very point* to be proved *depends* vpon them: as also what a *proper Argument* that is, which he draws from the *practice* of the *Arians* to conclude those of the *Church* of *Rome* guilty of *Idolatry* in the *worship* of *Saints*; for they do not think them to be *Gods*, nor worship and serve

them (the word is λατρεύειν) with the worship *proper* to God, nor fix their hopes of *Salvation* in them, nor expect *Judgment* from them, as *S. Gregory* ſaith the *Arians* did all theſe things to *Chriſt*, though they believed him to be a *Creature*.

Cathar: But Dr. St. as I remember, ſaith that *although the Arians did invocate Chriſt, and put their Truſt in him, yet they ſtill ſuppoſed him to be a Creature, and therefore believed, that all the Power and Authority he had was given him; So that the worship they give to Chriſt muſt be Inferiour to that honour they gave to the ſupream God, whom they believed to be ſupream, Abſolute, and Independent*; and in *this* it is he makes *their* worſhip of *Chriſt* paralel to *that* vſed by the *Church* of *Rome* to the *Saints*.

Eunomi: This indeed is brought in by the Dr. at the convenient diſtance of three hundred and fifty Pages after the Paſſage we ſpoke of, and that without any particular mention of *S. Gregory*, or relation to him. A very late *Salve* for ſo old a *wound*; and a very *improper* one too when all is done, there being ſo many

things, which show it not only to be *incongruous* to make the intended Paralel, but *inconsistent* both with the practice of the *Arians*, and the doctrine of the *Fathers*. For

S. Aug. li. 20. cont Faust. c. 21. S. Greg. Naz. Orat. de Nat. Christi. S. Hier. Ep ad Marcellam.

1. The *Fathers* in general, and particularly *S. Gregory* in the Oration now cited by me, acknowledge a worship *due* to the *Saints* (and called by the same S. Gregory *a Pure Worship*) Inferiour to the worship *due* to *God*. And therefore could not have condemned the *Arians* of *Idolatry* for giving only *a like* worship to *Christ*, though in a higher degree, without condemning themselves of the like crime.

2ly However the Dr. now makes this plausible *Apology* for the *Arians*, yet I do not find that the *Arians* made it for themselves. What he saith of it himself (pag. 165.) is, *that we may suppose this was the Answer of the Arians.* And whereas he adds speaking *of S. Athanasius, that he could not but foresee it, and a man of so much understanding, as he was, would have prevented this Answer had he thought it to his purpose.* I should rather think, if a man of so much understanding as he was, thought it not to his pur-

poſe *then* to prevent it, it were but litle to the purpoſe *now* for the Dr. to alledge it.

3ly Although the *Arians* believed that all the Power and Authority, which Chriſt had, was *given* him by the Supream *God*, whom they believed to be *Supream, Abſolute, and Independent*; yet why might not the *Generality* at leaſt, believe him to be of a Superiour Order, ſo as to haue *true divinity* in him, as the *Heathens* did of th ir *leſſer Gods*, and that being aſſumed, as a *Conſort* in the *Empire*, Abſolute divine honour was due to him? *S. Gregory* ſeems to intimate as much in the words left out by the Doctor, where he ſaith, that the devil under a pretence of Chriſtianity brought Idolatry again inſenſibly into the world, perſwading men, not to recede from the Creature, but to adore and worship it, and think a creature to be God having given it the name of the Son; and although it were of a different nature from God, not to regard that, but placing the name of Chriſt vpon a Creature, to worship and ſerve it with *Latria*, to fix their hopes of ſalvation in it, and expect »

Judgment from it. This I hope is farr enough from the Dr's *Relative* or *Inferiour* worship; and whoever reads the *Fathers*, shall find they euermore charge the *Arians* for giving *absolute* Divine worship to *Christ*, though they believed him to be of a different nature from the *Supream God*. But if nothing will serve the Dr. but that we must suppose the *Arians* to haue answered, as he would haue them, viz, *that the worship they gaue to Christ, was Inferiour to that honour which they gaue to the Supream God*; I answer,

4thly That the *Fathers* notwithstanding had all the reason in the world to look vpon this as a meer *Sophistical Pretence*, and to charge them with *Idolatry* for doing what they did, when they saw them avowedly giue those acts of *worship* to *Christ* believing him to be a *Creature*, which by the Common Consent, and publick practice of *Christians*, from whence Exteriour *signs* in the duties of Religion receive their *determination*, were understood to be due only to *God Incarnate*, as calling him God when they had given him the name of the *Son*, putting their Trust in

him as the *Mediato of Redemption*, and invoking him as the *Judge* of the Quick and the Dead &c. Which makes the caſe of thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome*, even in this Suppoſition, to be quite different from that of the *Arians*; the Acts of worship which they giue to *Saints* and *Images*, being *ſuch* as by the common *uſe* and *Cuſtome* of the *Chriſtian* world before *Luther* were determin'd and underſtood, when applied to *Saints* and *Images*, to expreſs an *Inferiour* degree of Reverence or worship, than what is *due* to God himſelf, as *Bowings*, *Proſtrations*, *burning of Incenſe*, *lighting of Candles*, uſing certain *forms* of *words* and *Expreſſions* in prayer &c. in like manner as *Bowing* (though particularly expreſs'd in the Commandment as forbidden) to the *Altar* is at preſent determin'd and underſtood in the *Church* of *England*. This the Dr *foreſaw* very well, but found no way to *prevent* it but by ſuppreſſing the words of *S. Greg. Nyſſen*, in which he clearly expreſſes the *different* worship which the *Arians* gaue to *Chriſt*, from that which is given by thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome* to *Saints* and *Images*. And this I ſaid was ſo much

the more *foul*, for that he had been so *fairly* fore-warned of it by his Adversary T. G. in the like case of *his Constantinopolitan Fathers*. Pray then let me desire you to keep *this* in memory together with the *former* passage out of *Cardinal Lugo*, till more come.

Cathar: I fancy you haue *picked* out this passage, as one you judge *the most faulty* in the whole Book; but both *this* and the rest, when brought to *Triall*, may happily proue like *that Heauy charge*, as Dr. St. calls it, wherewith T. G. loads him for *cogging* (as he phraseth it) the word *Diuinity* in the singular number instead of *Adorable Deities* in the plural, into a *Testimony* he cited formerly out of *Arnobius* in his *Roman Idolatry* p. 74. The Dr. to shew his *Innocency*, assures T. G. that *the words he translated were these very words of Arnobius*, nihil numinis inesse simulachris, *that the Images haue no Diuinity in them*; and generously referrs himself to *him, if he please to take it vpon his word, or if not, to search the place once more*.

Cath. no Idol. p. 101.

Def. p. 471.

Eun: This is to bring the *businesse* to the *Test*, and T. G. it seems may do

as he *pleases* But do you your self *believe* it to be so?

Cathar. Yes without doubt; for the Dr addes, *that if these words be not in that very place: and but two lines before those quoted by T. G. viz, Erras & laberis &c. be will venture his credit in citing Authors vpon T. G's. Ingenuity.*

Eun: This argues a greater *Confidence* in T. Gs. *Ingenuity*, than I could euer haue *expected* from one who charges him so often with *desingenuous dealing*. But it may be the Drs. *good wishes* haue wrought some good *effect* vpon him, However I should think *him* in a manner *obliged* for his kind offer to *take it vpon his word.*

Cathar: But then again, *if these very words be there* as Dr. St. saith, *most certainly they are, what doth such a man deserue for so notorious fair dealing*?

Eun: Here the Dr. comes briskly vp indeed to T. G. if he fail not in the *Tryal* of the cause, which I think he *does*. And to make it *plain* to you, giue me leaue to ask you this one *Question*. When Dr. St. tells us, *that the Heathens in Arnobius deny they euer thought their Images to be Gods or to*

Rom: Idol. p. 74.

haue any Diuinity in them, but what only comes from their Consecration to such an use, whether did he *translate* the words of *Arnobius* to the *Heathens*, or the words of the *Heathens* to *Arnobius*?

Cathar: Doubtlesse the words of the *Heathens* to *Arnobius*, for he saith, *The Heathens in Arnobius deny &c.* And were it otherwise, he must haue *translated* the words of the *Obiection*, made by *Arnobius*, for those of the *Heathen's Answer*, which had been *no fair dealing* in case they were *opposit*.

Eun: And that you may see this to be in very deed the *case* at present, (supposing the Drs *design* was to proue by that *Testimony*, that *the Heathens did not worship the Images themselues for Gods*,) hear the words as they ly in *Arnobius*. *Erubescite ergo vel serò*, saith he, *& doceant vos animantia muta nihil diuinitatis inesse simulachris, in quæ obscœna dejicere neque metuunt neque vitant. Sed erras inquitis, & laberis, nam neque nos æra, neque auri argentique materias, neque alias, quibus signa confiunt, eas esse per se Deos, & religiosa decernimus numina; sed eos in his colimus, eosque veneramur, quos dedicatio infert sa-*

Li. 6. cont. Gent.

cra,

cra, & fabrilibus efficit inhabitare ſimulachris. *Arnobius* had objected to the *Heathens* the *Indignities* done to their *Images* by *Spiders*, *Swallows* and ſuch other creatures; and bids them at length to *be aſhamed, and learn from them, there was no divinity in their Images.* And what do the *Heathans* reply to this? 1. *They deny they euer thought the Images themſelues to be Gods, and adorable Deities.* 2dly They grant *they worshipped the deities reſiding in them by the vertue of dedication*, and therefore tell him he was *miſtaken*, when he ſaid *there was no divinity in them.* This was the *ſubſtance* of the *diſcourſe* p 473. And Dr. St. taking part with the *Heathens*, nothing can be more *evident*, than that the words *deſigned* to be *tranſlated* by him, were the words of the *Heathens*, in which *they deny the Images themſelues to be Gods or Adorable Deities*, (which is *the thing* he ſaith be *produced* *Def. p. 473.* *that Teſtimony to proue*:) and *not* the words of *Arnobius* [viz *that there was no divinity in their Images*] which the *Heathens* excepted againſt, as *not denying* but that *they worshipped adorable Deities brought into them by Dedication.*

For my part I think the Dr. might better haue *excuſed* himſelf by imputing it to a *caſual vndulation* of the *Viſual Rays*, incident at times to the *beſt Tranſcribers*, eſpecially when the *words* are but *two lines* diſtant, (as he aſſures us they were *no more* in his Copy) and there is an *appearance* of ſome *affinity* between them; than by *profeſſing* he intended to *translate* the words of *Arnobius* and not of the *Heathens*, in a *Teſtimony* wherein the *Heathens* deny the words of *Arnobius* to be *true*. But if, you haue yet *Faith* enough to believe it vpon *his word*, that the words he tranſlated were theſe *very words* of *Arnobius*, *nihil divinitatis in eſſe ſimulachris*, that *there was no divinity in their Images* (not *two* but *four lines* in the Copy I haue which is of the *largeſt* ſort of Folio's aboue thoſe words of the *Heathens* he began to *translate*) he hath *reaſon* ſo farr to acknowledg your *kindnes*: but then you muſt grant him *guilty* of what T. G. lays to his charge, viz, of *cogging* the word *Divinity* in the ſingular number, inſtead of *Adorable Deities* in the plural (which was quite left out by him) into the *Teſtimony* of the *Heathens*;

and that *contrary* both to their *meaning*, who believed ſuch *deities to dwell in them*, and to his own *deſign* in producing that *Teſtimony*, which he ſaith was *to proue, that the Heathens denied that they worshipped the Images themſelues for Gods*, and not that they denied *they worshipped the Deities aſſiſting in them*. Read ouer the *words* once more, which *if you pleaſe you may take vpon my word, or if not, ſearch the place in Arnobius*, and I believe you will confeſſ, that if the Dr. makes no better a *defence* for the *Teſtimonies* he cites out of *Cardinal Lugo*, and S. *Gregory Nyſſen*, than he hath done for *this* of the *Heathens* in *Arnobius*, we are like to haue but a *ſad account* of Citations from him; and *Impartial* Readers will hardly be perſuaded to *take* them vpon *his word*, but rather return his *own Queſtion* vpon him in downright *English, What doth ſuch a man deſerue for ſo notorious foul dealing*?

Cathar: Before I paſſ my *Judgment* I ſhall with your leaue *ſearch* the place in *Arnobius* himſelf.

Eun: I commend your *warineſſ*, and wish the reſt of his Readers would do

the *like*. In the mean time, we will return if you please to *what* we were vpon, and see what it is he finds *fault* with in the *Council* of *Trent*.

Cathar: And not to *deferr* it to a longer time, I *remember* very well; He makes *three Observations* vpon the doctrine of that *Council*, The First is : : : :

Eun: I see you haue him at your *fingers ends*, but let us first if you please hear the *words* of the *Council* as set down by *him*.

Cathar: You do not intend I hope to except against his *Fidelity* in the *Relation* of them.

Eun: I am not so quarrelsome, *Catharinus*, as you take me to be, though I think he hath *translated* them also to his *best advantage*. But my *Intention* is *other* at present as you will understand, if you please to *repeat* the words.

Def. p. 613. *Cathar*: *That wary Council*, saith the Dr. *knowing very well the practice of their Church and the Opinion of Divines, only determines due honour and Veneration to be given to Images, not for the sake of any Divinity or power inherent in them, for which they are to be worshipped, or that any thing is to be*

asked of them, or that Truſt is to be put in the Images, as it was of old by the Heathens, who placed their Hope in Idols; but becauſe the honour which is done to them, is referred to the Prototype, which they repreſent, ſo that by the Image which we kiſſ, and before which we uncouer our heads, and fall down, we adore Chriſt and worſhip the Saints which they repreſent. Which hath been already decreed by Councils againſt Oppoſers of Images, eſpecially the 2d Nicen Synod. Theſe are the words of the *Council* related by him.

Eun: And *what* I pray do you *find* in them, from which it may be *gathered* that the *Council* intended to *require* of thoſe of its *Communion* to giue the *honour due* to *Chriſt* and his *Saints*, to the *Images* themſelues?

Cathar: The words I confeſſ are very *warily* couch'd and ſo much *warineſſ* makes us ſuſpect *craft*, as the Dr. hath very clearly *diſcouered* in the *Obſeruations* I began to tell you, he makes vpon *them*. The Firſt whereof is, *that all External Acts of Adoration are allowed to be done to Images.*

Eun: To this I haue anſwered already, p. 216.

that the *Church* is at *liberty* to *determin* what *external Acts* she thinks fit to make *vſe* of towards *Images*, and *thoſe* the *Church* of *Rome* makes vſe of (for of *all* She doth not) are *no leſſ* (if not *more*) underſtood by common *conſent* and *cuſtome* as *tokens* and *expreſſions* of a *Relative reſpect* to *Images*, than *Bowing towards the Altar* in the *Church* of *England*.

Cathar: But as Dr. St. *obſerues* in the 2d place, *There is not the leaſt Intimation in the Council againſt giving the ſame kind and degree of worship to the Image, which is given to Chriſt himſelf.*

Eun: But how ſo I pray! Doth not the Dr. himſelf acknowledge that the *worship* required by the 2d *Council* of *Nice*, was *lower than Latria, which is due to God*; and doth not the *way Council of Trent* as related by him *refer* us eſpecially to *that* of *Nice* in this matter? how then could *he* ſay *there was not the leaſt Intimation in the Council againſt giving the ſame kind or degree of worship to the Image, which is giuen to Chriſt himſelf?* Is it not *ſtrange* he should *forget* himſelf ſo *ſoon?*

Cathar: But the *Divines* it ſeems did not *underſtand* it ſo, and therefore as he *obſerves* in the *Third* Place; *After the Council of Trent, many of the moſt Eminent among them haue aſſerted the worſhip of Latria to be given to Images.* pag. 614.

Eun: This is a *Feild* into which Dr. St. makes frequent *excurſions*, and *triumphs* exceedingly in his *own* Conceit. But hath not T. G. ſufficiently *ſhewed*, that even *thoſe* very *Divines* who call it *Latria*, do not mean by the word that *proper* divine worſhip which is *due* to *God* and terminated vpon *him*; but that the *Act* being in their Opinion *One* in *ſubſtance* to the *Prototype* and the *Images*, it is *terminated abſolutely* vpon the *Perſon* of *Chriſt* for himſelf, and falls vpon the *Image* after an *Inferiour* manner, as a thing only *relating* to him and purely for *his* ſake; as you heard but even now out of *Cardinal Lugo*: For which reaſon ſome of *them* call it *Relative Latria*. Others, *Secondary*; Others, *Improper*, others, *Analogical*; others, *per accidens*: And the *diſpute* in effect, as T. G. obſerves, is rather *de modo loquendi*, than of the *thing* it ſelf. For they all agree, that the *Cath. no Idol. p.* 190.

worship proper to God, signified primarily by the word *Latria*, is *not* to be given to *Images*. But now *for the loue of Controuersy*, what is all this to the *doctrine* of the *Councel*? Cannot a man giue *due honour* to the *Image* of his *Prince*, or of *Christ*, unleſſ ſubtil *diſputants* be firſt agreed by *what name* it muſt be called? What Dr. St. ſhould haue done to *maintain* his charge of *Idolatry*, was to *proue* out of the *decrees* of the *Council* it ſelf, that the *due honour* and *Veneration*, it declares lawful to be giuen to *Images*, is the *Latria* due to *God*. But this was too hard a *taſk* for him to undertake, and therefore to *divert* his Reader he *entertains* him with a *pleaſant Counterſcuffle among the School-divines, about reconciling their doctrine with the Definition of the Council of Nice*, to which the *Council* of *Trent* refers; as if it were a greater *wonder* that they cannot *agree* in *this*, than in thoſe other *Nice points concerning Predeſtination*, and the like; Or as if *the Church may not haue liberty not to determin either* the *one* or the *other*; *and ſo both parties remain of the Church* (as Dr. St. inſinuates of the latter) *as long as they contradict*

Def. p. 620.

Gen: Pref.

not

received Articles in it. But *ſomething*, or rather a *great deal* was to be ſaid, though *nothing* to the purpoſe, as I ſhall let you ſee. For *what* he charges the *Church* of *Rome* with in his *firſt Paper*, is that *all thoſe who are of the Communion of that Church, muſt by the terms of Communion with her be guilty either of Idolatry or of Hypocriſy*: But the *terms* of *Communion* with *that Church* are *not* the *Opinions* of her *School-divines*, but the *decrees* of her *Councils*: And therefore for him to repreſent *them* in a *pleaſant counter-ſcuffle*, may be a *pleaſant diverti ſment* to ſome *kind* of Readers, but *no Satisfaction* to the *Wiſe*; ſince the *Divines* themſelues are not *Roman-Catholicks* for maintaining their *Opinions*, but for *ſubmitting*, on all ſides, to the *Decrees* of the *Councils*.

Cathar: But what *Security* can be *expected* from ſuch an Anſwer? when *each ſide charging the other with Idolatry, the General Terms of Councils*, (as Dr. St. ſaith very well) *ſerue only to draw men into the ſnare, and not to help them out of it.* Def. p. 849.

Eun, *Security* enough (as T. G. tells us) from *honeſt nature* informed with Cath: na Idol. p. 188.

Christian Principles, which will teach us to *honour* the *Image* of *Christ* for *his sake*, who is represented by it, with as litle *danger* of committing *Idolatry*, notwithstanding the *Counter-scuffle between School-divines* about the *Act's* being the *same* or *distinct*; as it doth a *Subiect* to giue a *proportionable Respect* to the *Chair* of *State*; or a *Wife*, to *kiss* her *Husband's picture*, without fear of *committing* either *Treason* or *Adultery* by so doing. I should be glad, you could help me out here; For for my life I cannot understand, how a *good Wife* (to use the Dr's *old example*) is e're the *more* in *danger* of committing *Adultery* in kissing her *husbands picture*, because, were she ask'd the Question, she would be mightily *puzled* to tell, whether the *kindness* she expressed to the *Picture* were the *same* with *that* to her *Husband*, or *distinct* from it. And I am confident, had *his Maiesty* after his *happy Restauration* found it necessary to have made an *Order*, that *due honour* and *respect* should be given to the *Chair* of *State*, as formerly had been *done* (notwithstanding any *dispute*, which might haue been raised about *it's* being the

ſame or *diſtinct* from that *due* to the *King*; or the *Parties* growing hot, *accuſing* one another of *Treaſon* if it be the *ſame*, or of *ſubmiſſion to a meer Inanimate thing*, if *diſtinct*) you would not ſay *that the General Terms of the Edict ſerved only to draw men into the ſnare, and not to help them out of it.*

Cathar. For *that* Dr. St. tells us, that *the Rules of the Court are to be obſerved, where there is no intrenchment upon Divine Laws.* *Def. p.* 851.

Eun: And T. G. will tell us, *the Rules of the Church are in like manner to be obſerved for the other*, and *the diſpute* about the *Act's* being the *ſame* or *diſtinct* will equally *hinder* or *not hinder* the practice of *both.*

Cathar: Dr. St. indeed acknowledgeth the *caſe* to be alike in *both*; and therefore *to avoid Idolatry in the worſhip of Images*, he tells us, *men muſt giue none at all; eſpecially when there is no neceſſity at all of doing it.* *P.* 853. 854.

Eun: And will not your Friend, *Patronus Bonæ Fidei*, tell us, that *to avoid Idolatry in bowing to the Altar, men muſt giue no Reverence at all, eſpecially when there is no neceſſity* at *all of doing*

it? And the *like* may be said of *uncovering* the *Head*, or doing *Obeisance* to the *Chair* of *State*. But what will become then of the *Rules* of the *Court*, which the Dr. saith are to be *observed* and the *Rules* of the *Church* which *now* as you haue heard, he affirms in like manner are to be *observed*, if men may be permitted to *break* them for such *Capriches* as these are? Must *loue* and *duty* be tied vp to *necessity*? Haue they not a *larger Sphere* to act in? *Are not all things lawfull in the worship of God, which are not forbidden*? and vpon that account, *Bowing* to the *Altar* in the *Church* of *England*? Alas poor Dr. St.
p. 861. (would T. G. say, returning his own words vpon him) *how doth he argue like a man spent and quite gone*? 'Tis *high time* I see for us to draw to an end.

Cathar: But before we do that, I shall giue you a cleer and full *Solution* of the *Case*, by which you will see, the Dr. is not so *far gone*, as you imagin; *Whatsoeuer T. G. thinks*, saith he, *we*
p. 849. *say, that God by his Law hauing made some Acts of worship peculiar to himself by way of acknowledgment of his Soueraignty and Dominion ouer us, we must*

not use those Acts to any Creature. And therefore here, he saith, *the most Material Question can be asked is, whether the Acts of worship be the same, which we are to use to God or no,* i ē, *whether they are Acts forbidden or lawful?*

Eun: This is a most *material Question* indeed, and how does he *resolve* it, I pray?

Cathar: Thus, *that if the Acts be the Same, they are forbidden; if not, they may be lawful.*

Eun: This is, as farr as I can *understand* it, as if one should say, that if the Act be *such* as are *forbidden*, they are *forbidden*; and if they be *such* as are *not forbidden*, they are *not forbidden*. A very *cleer decision* of the case in the *Identical* way. But I pray tell me, Is not *Bowing* one of the *Acts*, nay the *only* External Act expressly *forbidden* by the *Law* to be used to any *Creature*? How comes it then, that *Bowing* to the *Altar* is *not Idolatry*; and the *same* to an *Image*, is *Idolatry*; when according to the Dr. *God having by his Law made this very Act of worship peculiar to himself, we must not use it to any Creature*, whether Image or Altar!

Cathar: To deal *plainly* with you *Eunomius* I evermore ſuſpected this *Bowing* to the *Altar* would *ſpoil* all. And I am cleerly of *Opinion*, euer ſince I read what my Friend, the *Patron Bonæ Fidei* ſaith of it that either *Himſelf* or *Mr Baxter*, or ſome ſuch other *Inflexible* man, had been a *fitter Champion*, to *manage* the *charge* of *Idolatry* againſt the *Church* of *Rome*, than Dr. St.

Eun: However, The Dr. is *a man of Tricks*, as well as T. G. and may perhaps haue ſome *Fetch* left behind, which we know not of: You may if you pleaſe *conferr* with him at leaſure, vpon *this Point*, and the *Premiſſes*. Only I ſhall deſire *two* things of you: The *one* is, to know of him, if he giue no other *notion* of *Idolatry*, than that of *External Acts ſtanding under a Prohibition*, how he charges all thoſe of the *Communion* of the *Church* of *Rome*, of being *guilty either of Idolatry*, *or Hypocriſy*, *either of which* he ſaith, *are ſins inconſiſtent with ſalvation*. For if any *creature*, (whether *Image* or *Altar*) *being made ſo farr the Object of Divine worship that Men do bow down before it, doth thereby become an Idol*, I ſee they

Def. p. 439.

muſt be *Idolaters* who *do* it. But how they can be *Hypocrites* in doing it, and *not Idolaters*, (if the very *doing* it in caſe it be prohibited, be *Idolatry*) I do *not* underſtand. T'is an *Ænigma*, that deſerves an *Oedipus*.

The other is, if you haue ſtill *courage* enough to read over his *Defence* the *Second* time (which I believe you are the *only man* in the world will do) to deſire you to *look* now and then vpon the *Memorial* I gaue you at the end of the *Fifth Dialogue*, and to reflect vpon what I haue *shown* in theſe laſt four *Conferences* concerning *his Performance* in it. As 1. how all his *long* and *elaborate* diſcourſes are but the *Clamours* of *Vanity*, and the *ſubſtance* of them might haue been compriſed in a *Nut-ſhell*. *Dial.* 1. 2. How *his Notion* of *Idolatry's* *Dial.* 2. conſiſting in *External Acts* of *worſhip*, as ſtanding under a *Prohibition* of the *Law* of *Moſes*, quite ruins the *Paralel* he ſtriues to draw between the *Practice* of the *Heathens* (who were *not* under the Law,) and *that* of the *Church* of *Rome*.

3. How the *Conſequence* he urges from *Dial.* 2. the *worſhip* of *Images*, to the *worſhip*

of all *other creatures* is in its ſelf *uſeleſſ* to his Cauſe, and *not allowed* for *common practice* by thoſe very *divines* who
Dial.3.4. admit it in *ſpeculation*. 4. How being obliged to proue *his charge of Idolatry*, againſt the *doctrine* of the *Church* of *Rome* in her *Councils*, (as *that* from whence we are to take the *terms* of *Communion* with *that* Church) he makes it his *buſineſſ* all along to *Combate* the *Opinions* of the *School-Divines*. 5 How
Dial. 2. 3. 4. endeavouring to *evade* the *Inſtance* of *bowing to the Altar* urged by T. G. he muſt either *deny* any *Reverence* at all to be giuen to the *Altar*, or *involve himſelf* and the *Church* of *England* in the
Dial 4. *ſame* condemnation with *thoſe* of the *Church* of *Rome*. 6. How *different* the *Worſhip*, which the *Arians* gaue to *Chriſt* believing him to be a Creature, and for which they were charged with *Idolatry* by the *Fathers*, was from *that* which the
Dial.3.4. *Church* of *Rome* requires to be giuen to *Saints* and *Images*. Laſtly, how to make a *ſhow* at leaſt of anſwering, he is forced againſt his promiſe of *reporting faithfully* to pervert the *words* and *meaning* of the *Authors* he cites.

If you carry theſe *Remarks* along with

you, & join them to his *Omiſſions* laid down in the firſt five Dialogues of the Firſt Part, I doubt not but you will find all the *Principal Argaments*, with which he endeavours to *prop vp* his *tottering* Cauſe in his late *defence*, *defeated*, or returned vpon himſelf.

Cath. You haue, I confeſſ, ſpoken to many things, more than I did expect from you, and perhaps more, though you shrowd your ſelf under Mr *Thorndike's* Authority, than the *Church* of *England* will thank you for. Yet there is one Point remaining, which you haue but ſleightly only touched in paſſing, though Dr. St. make it the main ground, vpon which he builds his Confutation of T. G.

Eun: Whilſt I haue ſpoken but what *Mr Thorndike* did, or muſt haue ſaid, in his Principles, I haue litle reaſon to fear any *Reproof* from the *Church* of *England*: Nor haue you much, to expect any *thanks* for your ſollicitude in endeavouring to fix vpon her, as her Senſe, ſo foul a *Charge* as that of *Idolatry* againſt the *Church* of *Rome*. But what is this great Point you ſay hath been omitted?

Cath. It is this, that T. G. denies the

Heathen's ſupream God *Jupiter* to be the *One ſupream Being* Maker and Governour of the World, and makes them to be *Idolaters* only for worshipping the *Devil*. This is a Point, which Dr. St. hath proved ſo fully againſt him, that he hath reaſon to be *aſhamed* of impoſing ſuch a Notion of *Idolatry* vpon them.

Eun: I was in good hopes we had been at the End of our Work, and was preparing for the Countrey: But ſince you think *this* to be ſo main a Point and the reaſon, as I now remember why Dr. St. lays ſo much ſtreſſ vpon it, is becauſe he judges it *very material toward the true Vnderſtanding the Nature of Idolatry*. I ſhall deferr my Journey a week longer, and let you ſee where the *ſhame* lights. Only I ſhall beg a day or two's reſpite to order ſome affairs; and review ſome Notes I curſorily made, when I peruſed the Drs. Book: And then, God willing I will ſee you again.

Def. p. 24.

The End of the Second Part.

THE THIRD PART OF THE JUST DISCHARGE TO Dr. STILLINGFLEET'S VNJVST CHARGE OF IDOLATRY.

wherein

His great Concern to make Jupiter *to have been the* true God, *And the Sinister ways he takes to maintain it, are laid open.*

And

His Pretended Paralel from the Practice both of the *Vulgar* and *Wiser* Heathens,

More fully refuted.

By way of Dialogue

Between { *EVNOMIVS, a Conformist* & *CATHARINVS, a Non-Conformist.*

PARIS,

M. DC. LXXVII.

Avec Privilege du Roy.

THE THIRD PART.

THE FIRST DIALOGVE.

THE ARGUMENT.

THe Notion of the Heathen's Idolatry imposed on T. G. by Dr. St. refuted from the Places out of which it was pretended to be gathered. The Grand Question brought to tryall, viz whether the Heathen's Jupiter were according to the Fathers, the true God, or a Devil? The former asserted by Dr. St. the latter by T. G. and proved by plain and undeniable Testimonies of more than a whole Jury of Fathers besides Origen. The Dr's mighty Argument from the Inscription to the Vnknown God, shown to be not only Impertinent, but against himself.

CATHARINVS. EVNOMIVS.

Cath. Welcome *Eunomius*; Having consulted your *Note-Book*, and

considered the Point a second time, Pray tell me, if you ever met with any thing more *absurd* than T. Gs. Notion of the Heathen's Idolatry, as Dr. St. hath exposed it, viz, that *Idolatry is the giving the Soveraign Worship of God to a Creature, and among the Heathens, to the devil*, as if the *Idolatry* of the Heathens consisted only in their worshipping of the *divel*.

Def. p. 3.

Eun: A very *absurd* Notion indeed, if the Meaning of it be, that the *Heathens* had no other *Object* of their worship, but that *Evil Spirit* which we call the *devil*: And such an one, as evidently concludes T. G. to be no better skil'd in the Church-affairs of the *Heathens*, than the Dr. would make him be in those of his *own Church*, or of the *Church* of *England*. For *S. Augustin*, who I am sure understood very well the divinity of the *Heathens*, speaking of the many and false *Gods* worshipped by them, reduces them to these three Heads. 1. *The Images themselves.* 2. *Evil Spirits.* 3. *Or at best some Creatures, not the Creator*; *All which*, saith he, *they worshipped with that Worship, which is due only to the One true God.*

Li. 6. de civ. Dei. c. 1.

But Pray tell me, do you think it was T. G's. meaning to make the *Heathens* to be *Idolaters* only for worshipping the *devil?*

Cath. I do not see, what other meaning Dr. Sts. words can haue, when having told us in *general* what he and T. G. were agreed in, viz, that *Idolatry is the giving the honour due to God to a Creature*; he subjoins as the Point in difference between them, that the *Heathen's Idolatry* according to T. G. *consisted in worshipping the devil.* For this latter Proposition determins the more *General* one to that *particular Object*: Just as when we say, The main Point of the *Reformation* consists in giving the *Supream Authority in Church-affairs* not to the *Pope*, but some other and among those of the *Church* of *England* to the *King*, we take the meaning to be that they acknowledge the *king* to be under God the *only supream Head* of the Church.

Eun: The *Paralel* is Just, and I confess it made the same Impression vpon me, when I read it, and as many others as I haue discoursed with about it. But doth the Dr. cite any *passages* out of T.

G's. Book to shew that he advances this *abſurd* Poſition?

Def. p. 2. 3. **Cath.** A great many I can aſſure you from which he *gathers* it very plainly.

Eun: Pray do me the kindneſſ to let me hear them.

Cath That you ſhall, but litle to T. Gs. comfort or your own, if you intend to defend him.

Cath. no Idol. p. 36. 1. *Then T. G. ſaith, that the Worſhip of Images forbidden in the Commandment is the worſhipping Images inſtead of God: And the reaſon of this Law was to keep the People in their duty*

p. 63. *of giving Soveraign worſhip to God alone by reſtraining them from Idolatry.*

p. 67. 2*ly That this Law was made particularly to forbid Soveraign worſhip to be given (as T. G. ſaith it was given at that time by the Heathens) to graven Images, i. e. Repreſentations of Imaginary Beings; or to any ſimilitude i. e. the likeneſſ of any thing, which although it had a Real Being, yet was not God.*

p. 99. 3*ly That the Image-worſhip condemned by S. Paul, was the worſhipping of Images for Gods, or as the Images of Falſe Gods.*

4*ly*

4ly *That Evil Spirits or False Gods did reside in their Images by Magical Incantation.* p. 103.

5ly *That the Supream God of the Heathens was not the true God, but a devil.* p. 349.

Lo here the *Places*, from which the Dr. saith *it is no hard matter to form T. Gs. notion of Idolatry viz, that it is the giving the Soveraign Worship of God to a Creature, and among the Heathens to the devil.*

Eun: And it is well the Dr. tells us so, For had I been left to my own *mother-wit* I should haue inferred the *quite contrary* from these Assertions, viz, that T. G. made the *Idolatry* of the *Heathens* to consist in giving the *Soveraign worship* of *God* not only to the *devil*, but to *someting else* besides him. For Def. p. 3.

In the 1. of these Assertions, he euidently supposes the *Heathens* to haue been *Idolaters* for worshipping their *Images* instead of *God*.

In the 2d the Dr. himself confesses, that T. G. asserts *Soveraign worship* to haue been given by the *Heathens* both to the Representations of *Imaginary* Beings (of which I suppose he will not make the *devils* to be) or to the *likeness*

of any thing, which although it had a *Real* Being, yet was not *God*: of which kind the Heathens had good ſtore beſides the *devil*, as the Sun, moon, ſtars, Sea, Earth, &c.

In the 3d He makes *S. Paul* condemn the Heathens for worshipping the *Images* themſelues for *Gods*, (which certainly were not *devils*,) or as the *Images* of *False Gods*.

In the 4th He reckons indeed the *devils* for one of the kinds of the *False Gods*, to whom the *Heathens* gaue Divine worship, but not the *Only*. And in the laſt he affirms the Heathens ſupream God *Jupiter* to be one of thoſe *devils*. So that had I been left, as I ſaid, to my own *Mother-wit*, I should haue inferred from thoſe very Aſſertions of T. G. that he perfectly agreed with *S. Auguſtin* in making the *Heathens* to be *Idolaters* forgiving the worship due to *God* either to the *Images* themſelues, or to *Evil Spirits*, or to ſome other of the *Creatures*. and not to reſtrain their *Idolatry* to the worshipping only of the *devil*, as Dr. St. by *his Logick* would make his Reader believe. Here then you muſt acknowledg the Dr.

to haue prevaricated from the Design he tells us he hath, *of represeuting matters in diff rence truly*, when he imposes so *false* a Notion of the *Heathen's Idolatry* vpon his Adversary in the very Entrance of his *defence*; and that from passages of T. Gs. Book, which if I understand any thing, convince it to be *false*. But he hath conversed so much with the *Poets* and *Painters*, who represent *Jupiter* as the *Father of Gods and Men*, that he seems to haue learnt from them to *faign* his Adversary to say, what he pleases. And it may be it was for this Reason, that although at first he said, *The notion which T. G. lays down may be gathered from these Assertions of his*, yet at last he tells us only, that *from these Assertions it is no hard matter* to form *T. Gs. Notion of Idolatry*; an expression better suiting with the *Inventive* Faculty of a *Poet*, than the *Rational* Collection of a *Logician*.

Pref. to Roma Idol. p. 2. p. 3.

Cath. Be this as it will, the matter seems not great. I am sure, you cannot deny but that T. G. affirms the Supream God *Jupiter*, when the Heathens called the Father of Gods and Men, not to be the true *God* but a *Devil*. An As-

Cath. no Idol p. 348. 49.

ſertion ſo *wild*, *abſurd*, and *foolish*, as evidently betrays the litle *Skill* of the Advancer of it in the Writings of the *Fathers*.

Eun: Yet you know he cited *Origen* for it.

Cath. I know he did and then according to the cuſtome of that Party, tels us very judiciously, that *the Dr's Father of Gods and men was, according to the Fathers, an Arch-devil*, as if *Origen*, whom his *own Church* eſteems to haue been Heretical, were *all the Fathers* with him. But the Dr. I hope will teach both *him* and his *Fellows* here after to talk more ſparingly of the *Fathers*. Is it not poſſible, ſaith he, for you to entertain *wild* and *abſurd* Opinions but vpon all occaſions you muſt lay them at the doors of the *Fathers*. I haue heard of a place where the People were hard put to it to provide *God-fathers* for their *children*; At laſt they reſolved to chooſe two men that were to ſtand as *God-fathers* for all the Children that were to be born in the Parish: Juſt ſuch a uſe you make of the *Fathers*; They muſt *Chriſten* all your *Brats*; And how *foolish* ſoever an Opinion be, if it comes

p. 350.

D. f. p. 23. 24.

from you, it must presently pass under
the name of the *Fathers*. But I shall
do my endeavour to break this bad cu-
stome of yours; and since T. G. thinks
me a *scarce-revolted Presbyterian*, I shall
make the right *Father* stand for his own
Children. And because this is very *ma-
terial* toward the true Understanding the
nature of *Idolatry*, I shall giue a *full
account* of the Sense of the *Fathers* in
this Point; and not as T. G. hath done
from one single passage of a Learned
(but by their own Church thought
Heretical) Father, viz, *Origen*, pre-
sently cry out, *The Fathers*, *The Fa-
thers*. which is like a Country-Fellow,
that came to a Gentleman and told him
he had found out a braue *Covie* of Par-
stridges lying in such a Feild; The Gen-
tleman was very much pleased with the
news, and presently asked him how ma-
ny there were: what half a score? No.
Eight? No: Six? No. Four: No. But
how many then are there? Sir, saith the
Country-Fellow, It is a *Covie* of One.
I am afraid T. Gs. *Covie* of *Fathers* will
hardly come to One at last.

Eun: I See now, *Catharinus*, there
are many ways of *writing* besides with

a *Goat-quill*. The Dr. himſelf repreſents *the renowned Champion of our Lady of Loretto, writing with a Beetle*. And who would not think the moſt renowned Champion of *Jupiter* wrote this with a weaker, ſmarter Inſtrument? *Dionyſius* now turn'd Pedant neuer ranted more Magiſterially with *Birchen* ſcepter in his hand; nor reforming *Stepmother* euer uſed more zealous endeavours to break the former Wife's *Children* of their bad cuſtomes. But what if after all this T. G. and his Fellows will not ſtand corrected but rather venture a *fleaing*, than ceaſe to cry out vpon all occaſions, *The Fathers. The Fathers*? you ſay the Dr. will giue ſuch a *full account of their ſenſe in this Point* (the moyety whereof, if we may belieue him, *might be ſufficient to convince a Modeſt man*) as may ſerve to break this bad cuſtome of T. G. But were it not for ſpoiling the pleaſant ſtories of the Dr's *God-fathers* and *Partridges*, I could tell you of two Teſtimonies more cited in that very Page by T. G. in which, had Dr. St. looked into them, he might haue found *Theophilus Antiochenus* and *S. Auguſtin* aſſerting the ſame with *Origen*. But how

p. 785.

Cath. no Idol. p. 349.

Theoph. l. 1. ad Autol. S.

should he then haue come quit with T. G. for his ſtory of the *Count y-Fellow* that diſputed with the Guard about the *honour* due to the *Chair* of *State*? No weapon ſo proper againſt a Flail, as a Flail. But ſince the Dr. thought not fit to take notice of thoſe Teſtimonies for fear of loſing his Beloved *Covie* of One, I ſhall undertake to make it appear by more than a *Covie* of half a ſcore, that T. G. had reaſon to ſay as he did, that *the Heathen's Jupiter was according to the Fathers not the true God, but a Devil.*

Aug. in Pſ. 96.

p. 126.

Cath. You may ſpare your pains, if you pleaſe: *Eunomius*; For I dare venture half of all I am worth vpon the Dr's credit, that you will not find *two*, that will ſtand for the *Beat*.

Eun. You ſhall hazard nothing with me but a litle *Patience*

Cath. Of *that* I will giue you, as much as you pleaſe.

Eun. Firſt then for *Origen*, (the only *Father* cited by T. G. as Dr. St would haue it believed) nothing can be more expreſſe, than what he ſaith in the name of the *Chriſtians* of his time. *We are ready*, ſaith he, *to undergo any torments*

l. 5. cont. Ieſſ.

rather than confeſſ Jupiter to be God. For we do not believe Jupiter and Sabaoth to be the ſame, nor indeed to be any God at all, but a devil who is delighted with the name of Jupiter, an Enemy to Men and God. This is ſo clear a Teſtimony, that Dr. St. himſelf is forced to acknowledg it. *I grant*, ſaith he, *that* pag. 8. *Origen doth ſay ſo.*

Cath. But, he preſently addes, *Suppoſe S. Paul and Origen contradict one another, I deſire to know whom we are to follow*: and withall tells T. G. that *though Origen were a learned Father, yet he is thought by their own Church to be Heretical.*

Eun: For *S. Paul* I ſuppoſe you will giue me occaſion tō ſpeak of him hereafter: And for *Origen's* being thought *Heretical*, I hope your ſelf will be ſatisfied it was not for his aſſerting *Jupiter* to be a *devil*, if I ſhall ſhow, that in this he ſpeaks not his *own Senſe* alone, but the Senſe of the *Fathers* that went before him. Thoſe whoſe writings againſt the Heathens are come to our hands were chiefly *Juſtin Martyr, Athenagoras, Theophilus Antiochenus, Tertullian, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Minucius*

Minucius Felix. I shall take them in order as they lye.

First *Justin Martyr* giues this account of the Heathen's *Idolatry*, *that wicked devils of old appearing in Counterfeit shapes conversed with women, and wrought such strange prodigies in the world, that men astonished with fear, and not knowing them to be wicked devils, took them for Gods, and called every one by that name, which each devil had taken to himself.* And a litle after he saith, *The Images of the Heathens, did not carry the marks and form of God, but of those wicked devils who had appeared.* And then again, that He that was called *Jupiter* was one of them, he asserts in his first Apology, where he saith, that *the Poets and Mythologists, not knowing that the Angels, and Dœmons begotten by them had been the Authors of the Infamous practices he there speaks of, attributed them to God himself,* (by whom he means him, whom they esteemed their chief God and called him *Jupiter*, as appears by what he addes) *and to the sons begotten by him, and to those who are called his Brothers, Neptune and Pluto. For they called every one by that* Apol. 2.

name, which each of the Angels (i. e. Evil Angels) *had imposed on himself and those begotten by him.* From all which it is evident, that whatever Judgment later writers make of this Opinion of *Justin* concerning the *Angels* conversing with *Women*, yet it was *his Sense*, that the *Gods* of the Heathens were *devils*, and among them *Jupiter* the Supream.

Legat. pro Christ. p. 64. p. 66.

2. *Athenagoras* first shows from what the *Poets* and *Historians* relate of the Heathen's *Gods, that there was nothing in them that might induce us to believe, Saturn, Jupiter, Proserpine, and the rest of them to be Gods*: And then from the *Interpretations* of the *Philosophers*, pretending they meant by *Jupiter*, the Fire; by *Juno*, the Earth: by *Pluto*, the Ayr &c. having convinced themnot to be *Gods, neither Jupiter*, saith he, *nor Juno, nor Pluto*: He concludes that *those Gods, whom the Vulgar were delighted with* (of which *Jupiter* no doubt was one) *and bare the same names with the Statues or Images, were Men, as appears out of their History. But that they were indeed Divels, who assumed to themselves the names of those men, may be proved*, saith he, *from their Actions.*

3. The ſame is aſſerted by *Theophilus Antiochenus*, (cited by T. G. in the ſame Page with *Origen*) where he ſaith, that *neither She who is called the Mother of the Gods, nor her Children, are Gods, but Idols, the works of men's hands, and moſt impure devils.* Li. 1. ad Autolic.

4. After him follows *Tertullian*, and tels us. *We know the names of dead men to be nothing, as well as their Statues. But we are not ignorant that thoſe who act, and are pleaſed, and counterfeit a divinity under thoſe names and conſecrated Statues, are wicked Spirits that is, devils.* Again, *We worship*, ſaith he, *one God whom yee all know by the light of nature. As for the reſt whom you think to be Gods, we know them to be devils.* And that he eſteemed *Jupiter* to be one of them, and not the *true God*, is manifeſt from what he ſaith in his *Apologetick*, where ſpeaking of the Supplications made by the Heathens to *Jupiter* in the *Capitol*, he ſaith, they were in ſo doing *averſe both from God and Heaven.* And in the 23. chapter of the ſame *Apologetick* he ſaith. *We are eſteemed not to be Romans, but Injurious to them, becauſe we do not worship the God of the* li. de Spect. c. 1. & Apol. c. 27. Li. ad Scap. c. 1. Apol. c. 40.

Romans. Ti's well, saith he, *He is the God of All, whether we will or no. But among you, t'is lawful to worship any thing but the true* God; *as if He were not the* Great *God of all, whose We are All.* What could be said more expresse to remove that abominable pretence of the Drs. that the *God* of the *Romans* was the *true God.*

Protrept. p. 55. 16. Edit. Basil.

5. In the fifth place comes *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and agreably to the rest affirms of *all the Gods of the Heathens that they are the Idols of Devils*; *and of the most honoured among them, that they were great Devils, viz. Apollo, Diana, Latona, Ceres, Proserpina, Pluto, Hercules, and* Ipse Jupiter, *Jupiter himself.* This he proves from the *delight they took, as they professed, in the steam and Odour of the Sacrifices; and exacting men to be offered in sacrifice, to them*, of which he giue for examples, *Diana*, and *Jupiter.* So farr was He from thinking *Jupiter* to be the *true God.*

Pag. 87. Edit. Oxon.

6. But none speaks more home to the purpose than *Minucius* Felix: for, having described the several *Arts* and *Cheats*, by which these *impure Spirits*

lurking (as he ſaith) *in the Conſecrated Statues gained to themſelues the Authority and Eſteem of a Deity that was there preſent*, He addreſſes himſelf to the Heathens in theſe words, *All theſe things many of you know that the Devils confeſſ of themſelues, as often as by us Chriſtians being caſt out of the bodies they poſſeſſ, by the tormenting efficacy of our words and the Fire of our Prayers. Even Saturn himſelf, and Serapis, Jupiter* (mark that) *and whatsoeuer Devils you worship, being overcome with the torture, openly declare what they are. Nor is it to be conceived they lye to their own confuſion eſpecially ſome of your ſelves being preſent. Believe their own Teſtimony then, when they confeſſ the truth of themſelves, that they are Devils.* What would Dr. St. haue ſaid to this argument, had he been one of the Standers by, and heard *Jupiter* and the reſt confeſſ themſeves to be devils? T'is hard to imagine. unleſſ he will grant his true God *Jupiter* to haue *belied* himſelf, or deny the matter of fact to be true, which yet is avowed by *Tertullian* alſo in his Apologetick cap. 23. where he preſſes the Heathens with the ſame argument. *You who be-*

p. 89.

Theodoret. li. 3. c. 13. S. Hieron. c. Vigil. S. Aug. de civ. Dei li. 8. c. 26.

lieved them, saith he, *when t eylyed, Believe them when they speak Truth. No one lies to his own shame, but for his honour. T'is much more reasonable to believe them confessing against themselues than denying for themselues. These Confessions of your own Gods haue made many Heathens become Christians.* And I do not see, what the maintaining them not to be *devils*, when they confess it of themselues, can do, but dispose *Christians* to become *Heathens*. What think you of this *Catharinus*? Here you haue a Covie of half a dozen Fathers before *Origen*, who affirm the same that he doth. Had not T. G. reason then to say at he did, that *the Heathen's Supream God Iupiter was according to the Fathers an Arch-devil?*

Cath. But doth not Dr. St. from these very Fathers proue that he was the *true God*? Do the *Fathers* blow hot and cold, say, and unsay, as they please? You haue learn't I hope of T. G. to play *tricks*. Doubtless there must be One in this.

Eun: Yes And I hope to make you see where it lies before we haue done; if you will but comply with your promise, and haue a litle more patience,

whilſt I giue the *Senſe* of the moſt Eminent *Fathers* alſo who lived after *Origen*. And firſt,

Euſebius; who wrote his Books *de Præparatione Evangelica* expreſsly againſt the Heathens, and than whom no man underſtood their Principles better, tells them to their Faces, *that they lye, when convinced by the wicked Practices of thoſe they worshipped, they deny that they ſacrificed to devils. For to them*, ſaith he, *they gave worſhip; to them they Sacrificed men, and committed moſt abominable things in honour of them whom they deemed and called, the moſt Great Gods, viz. Saturn, Iupiter, Mars, Dionyſius, Iuno, Minerva, Venus, and the moſt Wiſe and Beautiful Apollo, to all whom the Heathens gaue the Titles of Dij Optimi Maximi, & Salvatores, of the moſt Good and moſt Great Gods, and Saviours*: But *Euſebius* proves them to be *moſt Pernicious devils. For if they be ſuch*, ſaith he, *as take delight in the ſlaughter of men, (and it is plain they are delighted with it, when they cannot be ſatisfied but with human Sacrifices) they are certainly convinced to be moſt wicked Spirits.——Nay farther, when by* Li. 4. c. 8.

their Oracles and Answers they required Men to be Sacrificed to them, and most horrible Impieties to be offered in their Temples, it appears in very deed that they are by nature most pernicious and wicked. Now if you ask who they were whom he chargeth with these things, *consult*, saith he, *but their own Historians, and you will find the whole world to have been subject to these wicked Spirits: Greece, Africk, Thrace, Scythia, the most wise people of Athens, and the Great City it self, for even there also in the Dialia men were offered in Sacrifice: Moreover Rhodes, Salamina, all the Islands, Chio, Tenedus, Arcadia, Lacedemonia, Ægypt. Phanicia, Libya, Syria, Arabia, In fine every where untill the coming of our Saviour, they appeased the most pernicious devil with the slaughter both of beasts and Men, and by most detestable abominations. For we have heard their own Historians acknowledge that these abominations were practised and continued untill the time of Adrianus, and that then all these horrible practices were understood and laid aside; that is, when the Preaching of the Gospel of Salvation had dispersed its beames through the*

world. This was the Judgment of *Eusebius* concerning the *divinity* of *Iupiter*: but it may be he was an *Heretick* as well as *Origen*; And so indeed he is esteemed by *S. Athanasius*, but not for proving *Iupiter* and the Rest to be most *wicked devils* in the manner he doth: for

S. Athanasius himself makes use of the same discourse, and for the same End, when speaking of the custome of the *Scythians* in offering part of the Prisoners taken in warr to their Gods, he saith *this Tragical cruelty was not to be imputed only to the natural Barbarousnesse of those People; but that it was the Proper Effect of the wickedness of the Idols and devils; For the Ægyptians also* saith he, *were wont of old to offer such kind of victimes to Iuno. The Phenicians likewise and those of Creet make Saturn propitious by immolating their children; And the ancient Romans also worshipped Iupiter Latiarius with sacrificed men.* By this you see in what esteem *Iupiter* was for a *God* with *S. Athanasius*; and with him agree the rest of the *Fathers*. *Orat. contr. Gent. in. med.*

S. Cyprian in his Book of the Vanity of *Idols*, makes use of the very argu- *De Idol. van.*

ments and words of *Minucius Felix* to prove them to be *wicked Spirits that lurk under the consecrated Statues and Images. S. Chrysostome* saith that the Idols of the Heathens are Stone, and Wood, and Devils. *St. Hierom* that unclean Spirits assist in all their Images. *Arnobius Senior* that *Jupiter* whom they called *Opt. Max.* and to whom they dedicated the *Capitol*, was not the true Omnipotent *God. Arnobius Junior*, that all the Gods of the Gentils, which were placed in the Temples, were inhabited by Devils. *Lactantius*, that Incestuous Spirits feigned many Celestial (Gods) and one the King of all *Jupiter*, because there are many Angelical Spirits in heaven, and one Father and Lord of all, God. But they haue taken a way, saith he, the truth from the eyes of men by involving it under counter feit and lying names. These, saith he c. 14. are the Authors of the Evils which are acted, whose Prince is the devil; whence *Trismegistus* calls him δαιμονιάρχην, the Arch-Devil: and these they take to be Gods. Lastly, not to keep your patience too long stretch'd, for I perceive you are uneasy, *S. Augustin* in the place cited by T. G. a

De Idol. van.

In 1. Cor. 8.

In Abac. 2.

Li. 1. adv. Gent.

In Ps. 95.

Li. 2. c. 16.

In Ps. 86.

litle after *Origen*, replying to one of the Dr's subtiller Heathens, who pretended as He doth, *that they did not worship the Image it self, but the Invisible deity which presided ouer such an Image.* Ego dico, I *assert*, saith he, *that in your Temples none but wicked Spirits are worshipped.* And a litle below, *such*, saith he, *were Diabolus* (the Devil himself or Arch-Devil) *& Dæmonia ejus*, his Angels. *He arrogated divine honour to himself, and to all the Devils, and filled the Temples of the Heathens, and perswaded* simulacra *Statues to be dedicated, and Sacrifices to be offered to them.* In like manner in his 4th Book of the City of God *A way*, saith he, *with this rabble of Innumerable Devils. He that thinks it enough for him to be Happy, let him serve the One God, who is the Giver of Happiness.* That is, according to Dr. St. *Jupiter*, but not so according to S. Augustin, for he presently addes, Non est ipse quem nominant Jovem. *It is not He whom they call Jupiter.* No; He puts him in among the rest when he saith, that *none but wicked Spirits or Devils are worshipped in their Temples.* C. 15.

Thus for a *Covie* of one (which the

Dr. almost despair'd of too (I haue presented you with more than a whole Jury besides *Origen*, of Eminent *Fathers* who all assert with him, that the Heathen's Supream God *Iupiter*, that is, (as himself describes him) *He that was worshipped in the Capitol at Rome with the title of Iupiter O. M.* was not the *true God* but a *Devil*. And it were easy to adde more to them if need were; But these I hope may serve to break that *bad custome* in the Dr. of ranting and vapouring without a cause, and we shall hear no more of his pretty storys of the *two God fathers*, and ridiculous *Covie of one*. Yet I cannot omit, for the great Esteem he hath for the Wiser Heathens to adde one Testimony more out of *Eusebius*, and that is of the great *Porphyrius*, who confesses it *to be the work of the Devils to draw the multitude by the allurements of Riches, Pleasures, Power, and Vain glory from the true Opinion concerning the worship of the Gods, to conferr it vpon them; and what is worst of all, to perswade not only the Vulgar, but many of the Philosophers also (as in effect they did) to believe, that the Gods themselves, even the Supream God of the Vniverse*

Def. p. 41.

Euseb. de prep. Evang. li. 4. c. 11.

were obnoxius, to the same Vices: which was, saith Eusebius, to perswade them *that the first or chief Spirits among them was the Supream God*. And had not the *Fathers* then reason to affirm, as they did, *that the Heathens Supream God was an Arch-Devil*, when so great a Patron of their cause, as *Porphyrius*, convinc'd by the Evidence of truth, was forc'd to confess it? What had become of half of all you are worth, *Catharinus*, had I permitted you to venture it vpon the Dr's credit?

Cath. You haue taken a great deal of pains, *Eunomius* to make so many *God fathers* stand for this *Brat*. And I cannot but thank you for your kindness in not accepting my Offer. But when all is done you haue done just nothing, unless on the other side you can make it appear that the Passages cited by Dr. St. to prove the Heathen's Jupiter to be the true God are *impertinently* alledged, or their Sense *mis-represented*, or their words *corrupted* by him. If you can do any or all of these, I must knock under the Table.

Eun: I readily embrace the Overture. And if I fail in the performance, ——

Cath. Hold *Eunomius*, You shall lay no wagers neither. Nor will it be safe for you, while *the Testimony of Scripture is so plain in this matter to any unbyassed mind, as appears by S. Paul's saying to the Men of Athens, when he saw the Altar to the Unknown God; Whom you ignorantly worship, Him I declare to you.* Pray hear the Dr's Paraphrase vpon this Text. *Did S. Paul mean the Devil by this? Did he in good earnest go abroad to preach the Devil to the world? Yet he preached him, whom they ignorantly worshipped, i.e. the Devil,* saith *T, G. although S. Paul immediately saith, It was the God that made the world and all things in it. And afterward quotes one of their Poets for saying* Τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν. *For we are his Offspring, and it is observable that the words immediately going before in Aratus are* Πάντη δὲ Διὸς καὶ χρὴ μέθα πάντες; *And he useth* Διὸς *twice more in the Verses before* Ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεθα —— μέσσαι δὲ Διὸς πᾶσαι μὲν ἀγυιαὶ, *which is the very word that T. G. saith doth signify an Arch-Devil, doth S. Paul then say, We are all the Devil's Offspring? and not an Ordinary one neither, but the very Arch-Devil's? Was*

Def. p. 6.

p. 7.

this his way of perſwading the Athenians to leaue the worship of Devils, to tell them, that they were All the Devil's Offspring? No. It was farr enough from him, for he inferrs from that ſaying of Aratus, that they were the Offspring of God. Γενος ἐν ὑπαρχοντες τοῦ θεοῦ *So that if S. Paul may be credited rather than T. G. their Iupiter was ſo farr from being the Arch-Devil, that he was the true God, Bleſſed for evermore.*

Eun: A very *Godly Paraphraſe* no doubt: but ſuch an one as plainly contradicts the meaning of S. *Paul*, if that *Altar* were not dedicated to *Iupiter*: as it appears moſt Evidently it was not, from the very *Inſcription:* which was not *Iovi Opt. Max.* whom they all knew very well, and to whom they had Altars particularly dedicated; but *Ignoto Deo to an Vnknown God*, whom they were ignorant of. And *S. Paul* himſelf gives this for the reaſon, why he cals the *Athenians* δεισιδαιμονεστέρους more Superſtitiously Religious, than others, becauſe not content with the commonly *known Gods*, (of whom *Iupiter* was certainly *One*,) they had erected an Altar to *One*, they knew not who. Could anv

thing then be more cõtrary to the meaning of *S. Paul*, than to argue from this *Inscription*, that *S. Paul* came to preach their *Iupiter* to the *Athenians*, when he expresly tells them, he came to declare to them a God whom they did not know? This had been a better Argument for T. G. to prove, that this *Vnknown God* was the only *true God* according to *S. Paul*, and that *Iupiter* and the rest whom they worshipped, were *False Gods* or *Devils*. But the Dr. hath *a Faculty of doing greater wonders with two words* (*Ignoto Deo*) than those of the *Church* of *Rome* with *Five* when he can thus easily change the *Devil* himself into *God*. *Lucifer* once attempted some thing like it, but failed in the design, and can only transform himself into an *Angel* of Light.

Cath. I confess the Observation you make from the Inscription (*Ignoto Deo*) is so plain and Obvious, that I wonder so acute a man, as Dr. St. could oversee it.

Eun: T'is the Glory of great Wits not to see that, which every one can see: but to discover that which none can see but themselves.

Cath.

Cath. But what do you ſay to that Obſeruation of his, that *S. Paul* cites the words of Aratus, *We are his offſpring*, when the Poet had *thrice* uſed the word *Iupiter* before thoſe cited by the *Apoſtle*?

Eun: I ſay, that for a Heathen Poet to apply the Attributes of the *true God* to *Iupiter* is no great great wonder; And if *Aratus* knew the *true God*, he might think fit to apply the name of *Iupiter* to him, as being the name of that Deity which was *Supream* among them, as *S. Auguſtin* ſaith of *Varro*; but it doth not follow, that *S. Paul*, becauſe he cited him, thought their *Iupiter* to be the *true God*. This was ſo farr from his thoughts, that he left out the words of *Aratus* (though as much for his purpoſe) in which mention was made of *Iupiter*; and made uſe only of thoſe, in which *Iupiter* was not named, (τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν, *For we are his Offſpring*) as being applicable in that Abſtraction to the *true God* only, whom he had taken occaſion from the Inſcription, *To the Vnknown God*, to declare unto them. And although the Relative, τοῦ (*His*) in *Aratus* refert to *Iupiter*, yet in *S. Paul* it referrs

Li. 1. de conſ. Evang. c. 22.

to him of whom he had ſpoken before, viz *the God who made Heaven and Earth, in whom we liue, and move, and haue our Being, as ſome of your own Poets* ſaith he, *haue alſo ſaid, For we are his Offſpring.* And that we might not think, as Dr. St. doth, that he ſpake of *Iupiter*, he immediately repeats the words aſſigning them their true and proper Subſtantive Γένος οὖν ὑπάρχοντες τοῦ θεοῦ, *Being therefore the Offſpring of God*, not τοῦ Διός, of *Iupiter*. What means this changing of the name, if according to *S. Paul*, as the Dr. ſaith, their *Iupiter* was ſo farr from being an *Arch-Deuil*, that he was the *true God*, Bleſſed for evermore? you cannot but remember what the ſame *S. Paul* ſaith 1. Cor 10.20. that *What the Heathens offer in Sacrifice they offer to Devils, and not to God.* And however the Dr. will haue *S. Paul and Origen to contradict one another*, yet I ſuppoſe he will not ſay, that *S. Paul* contradicts himſelf. Nor can you haue forgot, how when at *Lystra*, the Prieſt of *Iupiter* would haue offered Sacrifice to him as *Mercury*, and to *Barnabas* as *Ioue*, in whoſe ſhapes they ſuppoſed thoſe Gods to haue appeared,

Acts 14.

he not only forbad them to do it becauſe *they were men of like paſſions with them*; but with all told them, that the end of their coming was *to preach to them, that they might be converted from thoſe vain things* (that is, in the Phraſe of H. Scripture from their *Falſe Gods*) *to the Living God*. And now *Catharinus* (to return the Dr's own Figure of *Rhetorick* vpon him) pray tell me what you think: Did *S. Paul* mean *Iupiter* by this *Living God?* Did he in good earneſt go abroad to preach *Iupiter* to the world? yet he taught them to convert themſelves from thoſe *vain things* (their *Falſe Gods*) to the Living God, i. e. to *Iupiter* ſaith Dr. St. Was this his way to perſwade the men of *Lyſtra* to leaue the worſhip of their *Gods*, to tell them that he came to teach them to worſhip *Iupiter*? No. It was farr enough from *S. Paul*, for by ſaying *theſe vain things* he expreſsly tells them, that *Mercury* and *Jupiter* were two of thoſe *vain* and *falſe Gods*, and that he came to convert them from the worſhip of *them* to *the Living God*. So that if *S. Paul* may be credited, rather than Dr. St. *their Iupiter* was ſo farr from being the *true God* Bleſſed for

evermore, that he was the *Arch-Devil*, damned for evermore. What think you of this, Catharinus?

Cath. Marry, I think this *Rhetorick* to be a very dangerous thing, when the same *Figure* conveniently applied will serve to prove the Heathen's *Iupiter* to be the *true Supream God* according to Dr. St. and to be an *Arch-Devil*, according to T. G.

Eun: The thing is good in it self, but may be abused, as it is here by Dr. St. to put a Glosse vpon the words of *S. Paul* quite contrary to his meaning, as I haue shewed from the very Text it self, and other passages of the Apostle. And if he durst treat *S. Paul* himself in this manner to make him stand as *God-Father* to this Infamous *Brat*, what may we not expect he will do with the *Fathers*?

Cath. That is what I long to hear: What you can say to that *full Account*, which the Dr saith *he hath given of their Sense in this matter.*

Eun. Nor shall it be long before I giue you satisfaction in that Point.

THE SECOND DIALOGVE.

THE ARGVMENT.

THe greateſt part of the Teſtimonies of the Fathers produced by Dr. St. that is, All thoſe which import no more, than either that the Heathens had a natural knowledge of one Supream God, or that it was their Senſe that their Iupiter was He, ſhown to be Impertinent to the Diſpute between him and T. G. from the true State of the Queſtion. His injurious uſage of the Fathers, blaming them for charging the Heathens with more than they were guilty of, or themſelves could prove, (being indeed a tacite Confeſſion that he look'd upon them as Oppoſit to him) laid open in a clear Account of the Heathen's Theology, and the ſeveral ways, the Fathers took to refute it, all of them convincing, as is made manifeſt both from the arguments themſelues being rightly applied to their due ſubjects, and the ſucceſs they had.

CATHARINVS, EVNOMIVS.

Cath. T'is now, *Eunomius*, that I expect the performance of your *promise*, which was to shew, that the Dr's Citations out of the *Fathers*, to prove the Heathen's *Iupiter* to be the *true God*, are all either *impertinently alledged*, or *their meaning mis-represented*, or both *their words and Sense corrupted by him*. If you can do this, the Dr. for ought I can see must *stand* for his own *Child*.

Eun: This I confess is what I *promised*; and to perform it, it will be necessary in the first place to set down the *true State* of the *Question* between the Dr. and T. G. in this Point, which I take to be this, viz, *Whether the Heathen's Iupiter were according to the Fathers the true God*, that is, whether it were the *Father's own Sense* that *Iupiter* was the *true God*? That this is the *true State* of the *Question* between them, is evident from the D'rs own words; For having sufficiently reproached T. G. for affirming the Heathen's *Iupiter* to be according

to the *Fathers*, not the *true God*, but a *Devil*, what he ſaith he will undertake to do is *to break him and his fellows of the bad cuſtome* they have got of paſſing their own foolish Opinions under the name of the Fathers, *by giving a full account of the Senſe of the Fathers in this Point*, and not as T. G. had done from one ſingle paſſage of a learned, but by their own Church thought Heretical *Father*. Now what he reſolved to correct in T. G. at preſent was his pretending the *Senſe* of *Origen* to be the *Senſe* of the *Fathers*. And therefore in another place, I *commend*, ſaith he *T. G. for his Modeſty, that when he had ſaid this was the Senſe of the Fathers he produces no more but good Father Origen, and with great judgment ſuppoſes, that what he ſaid was the Common Senſe of the Fathers*. This appears yet farther from that Religious Aſſertion of his, that *if S. Paul may be credited rather than T. G. the Heathen's Iupiter was ſo farr from being an Arch-Devil, that he was the true God, Bleſſed for evermore*: where you ſee he makes it to be *S. Paul's Senſe*, that *Iupiter* was the *true God*, and therefore in the next page, having granted it to be *Origen's Senſe*,

p. 24.

p. 78.

p. 7.

p. 8.

that he was a *Devil*, he ſuppoſes *Origen* therein to *contradict S. Paul*. So that the *Queſtion* between them as I ſaid, is *whether it were the Senſe of the Fathers, that the Heathen's Iupiter*, that *Iupiter* O. M. for example, to uſe the Dr's own words, *that was worshipped in the Capitol at Rome*, were the
p. 14. *true God?*

Cathar. This I eaſily grant to be the true *State* of the Queſtion. But why are you ſo ſollicitous about it?

Eun: Becauſe there are many other *Queſtions*, which ſeem to bear ſome affinity to this, and yet are very *different* from it, as 1st. whether the *Heathens* did not acknowledge *one Supream God*? 2ly. Whether themſelues did not pretend that they underſtood this *Supream God* by *Iupiter*, and accordingly gaue to him the *Titles* due to the *Supream God*? 3dly. Whether the *Fathers* do not acknowledge that *this* was pretended by the *Heathens*? All theſe *Queſtions* I ſay, how ſpeciously ſoever connected they may ſeem to you, yet in truth they are very *different* from the point in debate between the Dr. and T. G. viz, *whether it were the Father's own Senſe*,

Sense, that Iupiter was the Supream God? For 1. Those very *Fathers* who assert the knowledge of the *true God* to be in all men by the light of nature, condemn the *Heathens* for worshipping the *Creatures* instead of the *Creator*, and particularly for worshipping *Iupiter*, whom they affirmed to be a *Devil*, as you heard before. 2ly Though the *Heathens* might pretend, they understood the *Supream God* by *Iupiter*, yet this was but the *Sense* of the *Heathens*, not of the *Fathers*. And 3ly though the *Fathers* acknowledge that this was pretended by the *Heathens*, yet they might be farr enough in their *own Iudgments* from thinking *Iupiter* to be the *Supream God*. From whence it follows, that as many of the Drs. *Testimonies* as shall be found to carry no farther, than either to prove, that the *Heathens* did acknowledge *one Supream God*; or that they themselues owned *Iupiter* to be the *Supream God*; or that the *Fathers* related only some *sayings* of theirs, in which they did so; do evidently fall *short* of the *Question*, which was not whether it were the *Sense* of the *Heathens*, but of the *Fathers* themselues that *Iupiter* was the *true God*? And here lies

the *Trick* which I *promised* to let you see.

Cath. T'is a *Subtilty* I confess which as yet I do not fully comprehend: and therefore desire you will explicate your self a litle more vpon each particular.

Eun: First then I say, that all those *Testimonies* of the *Fathers*, cited by the Dr. which serve only to prove that the *Heathens* had a knowledge of one *Supream God*, are altogether *impertinent* to prove it to be the *Sense* of the *Fathers*, that *Iupiter* was the *Supream God*; because those very *Fathers*, who affirm *this* of them, deny *Iupiter* to be the *true God*, and condemn the *Heathens* for giving the *honour* due to the *true God*, to him. And that you may see this to be so I shall cite you some of their own words. We know, saith *Arnobius that the knowledge of God is in all men by nature, but He is not Iupiter. Such is the force of the true Divinity*, saith *S. Augustin, that it cannot be altogether hidden to a Rational Creature in possession of the use of reason: For excepting a few in whom nature is too too much depraved, all mankind confesses God to be the Author of the world.* But that this was not the *Roman's Iupiter* he expresly affirms *li. 4. de Civ. Dei c. 17. 25. Non est Ipse quem Iovem nominant.* And in his

Li. 1. Adv. Gent. p. 9.

Tract. 106. in Io.

first Book *de conſ. Evang*, he proues the Heathens *did not worship the true God, becauſe they did not worship the God of the Iews. That there is one Supream Gouernour of the world*, ſaith *Minucius Felix, whom we call God. I haue the conſent of all* men: But as for *Iupiter*, he reckons him as you heard before, among the *Devils. When we ſee*, ſaith *Lactantius, the Worshippers of Falſe Gods oftentimes confeſſ the One Supream God. what pardon can they hope for their Impiety, in not acknowledging the worship of him who cannot poſſibly be altogether unknown to Mankind: When they ſwear, or wiſh, or giue thanks, they do not*, ſaith he, *name Iupiter, or their many Gods, but God. Thus doth Truth by the force of nature break from their reluctting hearts.* Laſtly, not to ſtrain your patience too much, *That God hath given ſuch or ſuch a Benefit*, ſaith *Tertullian, is the Voice of all, as alſo thoſe other Common Expreſſions, when they appeal to him as Iudge, God ſeeth, and I commend it to God, God will reſtore. O teſtimony of a Soul*, ſaith he, *naturally Chriſtian.* But then remarks, that *when they ſay theſe things, they lift not vp their Eyes*

c. 13.

p. 54.

p. 89.

Li. 2. c. 1.

Apol. c. 17.

to the Capitol, but to Heaven, *which they know to be the Throne of the Living God.* In like manner in his Book *de Anima*, a 5. *Give testimony*, saith he, *O soul, if thou knowest one only God from whom all things are: For we hear thee also saying that God hath given &c. By which Expression thou signifiest there is some such One, and that all power belongs to him; but at the same time thou denyest the rest to be Gods, whilst thou callest them by their own names, Saturn, Iupiter, Mars &c. For thou confessest him alone to be God, whom alone thou calleſt God. So that when thou sometimes callest those other* Gods *thou dost but borrow, or rather steal that name from another, whose properly it is.* And again, at the end of the Book, *In the very Temples*, saith he, *thou callest upon God as Iudge, but dost not appeal to any of the present Gods*, that is, who are worshipped in those Temples. *O Testimony of Truth which gives Evidence for Christians in the presence of the Devils themselues!* Many other passages could I cite to the same purpose out of *Iustin Martyr, Athenagoras, Clemens Alexandrinus, S. Cyprian*, and others, were I minded to amuze the world with a *great Book*: but these may suffice to let you see how *Impertinent* it

was to the point in debate (viz whether it were the *Senſe* of the *Fathers*, that *Iupiter* was the *Supream God*?) for Dr. St. to ſtuff out ſo many *Pages* with Teſtimonies to prove that the *Heathens* had the knowledge of one Supream God ingrafted in them by nature, when thoſe very Fathers, who affirm it of them, deny *Iupiter* to be the *Supream God*, and ſhow from the very Expreſſions and actions of the *Heathens*, that they themſelves acknowledged another diſtinct from *Iupiter* to be the *true God*.

Cath. Thus farr I think I comprehend your meaning, and muſt confeſſ that had the Dr. done no more, he had done but litle to the purpoſe. But there are other Teſtimonies produced by him, which evidently prove that the *Heathens* by *Iupiter* underſtood and worshipped the one *Supream God*.

Eun: This is the 2d Queſtion, which I ſaid might be propoſed. And to ſay the Truth, Dr. St. gives us a pretty full account of the *Fathers* in this matter. But what *Fathers* are they? The firſt (in dignity at leaſt) are the two moſt Reverend Fathers in *Iupiter*, Father *Romulus*, and Father *Numa*, whom he makes litle 2. p. 3. 34. 35.

Inferiour to *Moſes* and *Aaron* in their care to inſtruct the People in the knowledge and worship of the *One Supream*
p. 35. 36. *God.* To them he joins Father *Livy*, Father *Varro*, Father *Ennius*, Father *Plautus*, Father *Virgil*, Father *Ovid*, Father *Tacitus* and *Father Pliny*, who give to *Iupiter* the Titles of *Opt. Max.* and of *Father of Gods and men.* But then for fear theſe ſhould not be ſtrong enough to do the work he comes in with an *Arrier-ban* of other *Fathers*,
p. 44. who beſtow vpon him the Titles of *Omnipotent*, and *Chief of the Gods*, viz, Father *Balbus*, Father *Cicero*, Father *Seneca*, Father *Virgil*, Father *Soranus*, Father *Dio Chryſoſtom*, and Father *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus.* And then to put the matter out of all diſpute, he comes
p. 46. 49. over again with Father *Plautus*, becauſe *he affords us many Inſtances of prayers to the Supream God, as when the Punick Nurſe, cry'd out Proh Supreme Iupiter!* though like a Sawcy Miller he ioyn the
Pœnul. Act. 5. Sc. 3. Title of *Verſipellis* at the ſame time to
In Amphitr. Prol. that of *Summus Iupiter* for the lewd trick he play'd *Alcumena* in her Husbands abſence, leaving her *Vtrinque gravidam & ex viro & ex Summo Iove.*

Father Virgil alſo is brought in a third and a 4th time. (No doubt becauſe he was, as the Dr. tells us particularly obſerved by the ancient *Criticks*, to be *ſo Nice* and *exact* in all matters that concerned their Religion, as if he had been *Pontifex Max.*) and then addes to them, to compleat the number, Father *Silius*, Father *Perſius*, Father *Horace*, Father *Valerius Maximus*, and laſtly the diminutive Father, Father *Paterculus*, for concluding his Book with that Religious Invocation, *Iupiter Capitoline*, *Auctor & Stator Romani Nominis*. By this you ſee what *Fathers* they are, that Dr. St. is converſant with. But what is all this (in caſe the *Heathens* did give the Titles of the *true God* to *Jupiter* and that in the midſt of all his mad pranks, as Father *Plautus* doth, for which reaſon I remember I was taught at School to look vpon them as Profane Blaſphemers,) what is all this I ſay to the Queſtion between the Dr and T. G. which was not as I ſuppoſe, whether it were the Senſe of the *Heathen*, but of the *Chriſtian Fathers*, that their *Iupiter* was the *Supream God*? All theſe Teſtimonies therefore ought to be laid aſide

p. 46.

p. 54.

Amphitr. in Prol. & Act. 5. Sc. 1. Summus Imperator Divum atque hominum Iupiter, Is ſe dixit cum Alcume-

ua clam conſue-tum cubi-bus. 3.

alſo as *Impertinent* to the preſent pur-poſe.

The ſame I affirm alſo of thoſe *other Teſtimonies* relating to the 3d Queſtion, in which the *Chriſtian Fathers* are cited by Dr. St. as acknowledging that the *Heathens* pretended they underſtood by *Jupiter* the *Supream God*: For they might cite ſome ſayings of the *Heathens* to that purpoſe, and yet be of a *contrary Judgment* themſelues; as if One ſhould tell you, that Dr. St. ſaith *he ſits down with this contentment, that he hath defended a righteous cauſe, and with an honeſt mind*, He may think otherwiſe him ſelf for ought you know. Now that the Fathers were of a contrary Judgment themſelues in this Point is manifeſt, becauſe (as you heard before) they affirmed *Jupiter* to be a *Divel*, and proved him to be ſo from his *actions*; and rejected that pretence of the *Heathens* as *vain* and *Impious*: and conſequently all the Teſtimonies of this kind alſo, cited by the Dr. are altogether as *Impertinent* as the Former. Theſe things Dr. St. was not ignorant of, and thinking to *mend* the matter, has made it *worſe*. For what do you think he does? Very fairly he

takes part with the *Heathens* againſt the *Fathers* by endeavouring to make them appear either *Impertinently obſtinate* in not believing the *Heathens*; or if they did believe them, ſo *perversly Insincere*, as to make them *Idolaters* whether they would or no, for worshipping *Jupiter*, and this by ſuch kind of arguments, as according to him gaue the Advantage to the *Heathens*: And yet this is the man that undertakes to maintain it to be the *Senſe* of the *Fathers* themſelues, that *Jupiter* was the *true God*.

Cath. Here you muſt giue me leaue, *Eunomius*, to tell you, that I think you are too *Severe* vpon the Dr. for no man of an Ordinary *Mother-wit* would betray his cauſe by ſuch a *Tacit Confeſſio*, as this is, that he look'd vpon the *Fathers* as *Oppoſit* to him.

Eun: yet I ſhall prove what I haue ſaid from his own words. For what elſe doth he mean, when having varnished over the moſt Obſcene and abominable Ceremonies uſed by the *Heathens* in the worship of their *Gods*, with the gentle name only of *Indecencies, which the Fathers*, ſaith he, *charge the Practice of their Religion with*, he addes with a *But*. p. 40. 41.

that *as they were not to be excused in other things, so we ought not to charge them with more than they were guilty of*? And what that was, he tells us in the next words; *I mean*, saith he, *when all the Poetical Fables of Jupiter, are applyed to Jupiter O. M. that was worshipped in the Capitol at Rome.* You are satisfied now, I hope, *Catharinus*, that the Dr. makes the *Fathers* charge the *Heathens* with *more* than they were *guilty of*, which they could not do, but either they must not believe them, when they pretended *Jupiter* to be the *Supream God*; or if they believed them, must act against their consciences, and betray their own cause, by applying the *Poetical Fables of Jupiter to Jupiter O. M.* who was worshipped in the *Capitol*. Now that this was done by all the Fathers, Dr. St. very well knows. But *meer shame* would not permit him to lay so great a reproach upon them all at once, and therefore he picks out two at first viz, *Arnobius* and *Lactantius*, with whom he thought he might be more bold, and goes on in this manner. *But some Writers, are to be excused, who having been bred up in the Schools of Rhetoricians, and practising*

that Art ſo long before, when they came to be Chriſtians, they could not eaſily forbear giving a caſt of their former employment, As when Arnobius, ſaith he, *had been proving the natural Notion of one Supream God in the minds of men, he brings in the Romans anſwering, that if this were intended againſt them, it was a meer calumny, for they believed him, and called him Jupiter O. M. and built a moſt Magnificent Temple to him in the Capitol: which he* (i.ē. *Arnobius*) *endeavours to diſprove*, (mark that) *becauſe God is Eternal, and their Jupiter was born, and had a Father and Mother and Vncles and Aunts, as other Mortals have. Which indeed*, ſaith the Dr. *was an Infallible Argument, that Jupiter of Crete could not be the Supream God, but for all that, might not the Romans call the Supream God by the name of Iupiter Opt. Max?* where he evidently diſallows the diſcourſe of *Arnobius*. and ſhows how it was, or might have been avoided by the *Heathens*, had he been to anſwer for them. In the ſame manner he treats *Lactantius*, *for ripping up*, (as he calls it) *all the Extravagancies of the Poets concerning Iupiter*, interpoſing p. 42.

presently in their behalf, *as though the Romans at the same time believed him to haue done all those things, and to haue been the Supream Governour of the world.* And when *Lactantius* to enforce his argument, and confute this pretence of theirs alledges, that *they themselues confesse the same Iupiter to haue been born of Saturn and Rhea*, the doctor replyes vpon him, that *he might haue done well to haue explained himself a litle more.* And what is this I pray, but to tell us, that these *Fathers charged the Heathens with more than they were guilty of*, and that not being able to make good what they charged them with, they thought to fob them off *with a cast of their former employment*?

Having thus broken the *Ice* he now dares venture to fix the same reproach, p. 74. though more covertly, on *Clement Alexandrinus* also: for having told us, how *he understood the Principles of the Heathen Theology as well as any, and exposed all their Poetical Fables, and Greek mysteries with as much advantage as any Christian Writer*, he gives us this very honourable account of his p. 75. performance. *After he hath sufficiently*,

ſaith he, *derided the Poetical Theology and the Vulgar Idolatry, he comes to the Philoſophers, who did he ſaith make an Idol of matter; and after reckoning vp Thales, Anaximenes, Parmenides, and others, he calls them all Atheiſts, becauſe with a foolish kind of Wiſdom they did worship Matter, and ſcorning to worship wood and Stones did deify the Mother of them: And ſo runs out,* ſaith he, *after his way* (which in the Dr's. Rhetorick ſignifies he run out of the way) *into a diſcourſe about the Several Nations, that deſpiſed Images, and worshipped the Several Parts of the Vniverſe, and the Symbols of them, as the Scythians, Sarmatians, Perſians, and Macedonians. And then reckons vp other Philoſophers that worshipped the Starrs, as animated Beings; Others, the Planets and the world, and the Stoicks who ſaid, God paſſed through the meaneſt parts of Matter.* By this account the Dr. gives of *Clemens* his performance (however he treat him with more reſpect than he had done *Arnobius* and *Lactantius*) yet it is evident he looks vpon *his way* of confuting the Heathens, as inept and frivolous alſo.

But none is represented by him to haue been so much baffled by the *Heathens* in the Point of *Iupiter's divinity*
p. 94. as *S. Augustin*, of whom he saith, *It is true, that He argues against* the Heathen's pretence of *Iupiter's* being the *true God from the Poetical Fables about Saturn and Iuno, but confesseth withall, that they thought it very unreasonable for their Religion to be charged with those Fables, which themselues disowned.* And hitherto *S. Augustin* goes along with his Fellows, that is, he argued just as wisely as they had done before him. But this last acknowledgment of the Heathens Pretence it seems wrought a different effect in him, from what it had done in them. For whereas they were so *Obstinate* as to persist in rejecting and impugning this pretence of the *Heathens* as vain and absurd, *S. Augustin*, according to what the Dr. addes of him, was so convinced of the evidence of it, that *therefore at last he could not deny that they believed themselues, that by the Iove in the Capitol they understood and worshipped the Spirit that quickens and fills the world, of which Virgil spake in those words, Iovis omnia plena.* And

had not one wise word to answer for himself, but sit down and *wonder, that since they acknowledged this to be the Supream, if not the only Deity, the Romans did not rather content themselves with the worship of him alone, than run about and make so many addresses to the Petty and Inferiour Deities.* Thus had Dr. St. been constituted *Umpire*, the *Victory* had been given to the *Heathens*; and *S. Augustin* (at least whilst he argued against them from the *Poetical Fables*,) and the rest of the *Fathers* had been condemned as *Impostors, for charging the Heathens with more than they were guilty of*, or themselves could prove. This kind of procedure would have suited much better with the *design* of *Iulian*, than of the *Reformation*, and it cannot be presum'd, but that that Religious Emperour, who *utterly also rejected the Poetical Fables concerning the Gods*, would have had a very high esteem for such a *Champion*. p. 88.

Cath. These passages I must acknowledge, argue a great deal of kindness and tenderness in the Dr. for the poor *Heathens*, to see them so ill treated by the Fathers. And it was but *Christian Gene-*

rosity in him to do them right; especially when the *Papists* themselues confesse they do not take all the Arguments of the Fathers to be *Infallible demonstrations*.

Eun: But where was his *Christian Generosity*, when himself charges the poor *Papists* with *more* than they are *guilty* of, if their Publick *Professions* are to be believed; at least with what themselues *deny*? They must be made to take the *Saints* for *Gods*, and worship the very *stocks* and *Stones* as such, whether they will or no. Was all his tenderness spent vpon the *Heathens*, and none left for his *Fellow Christians*? Not one kind *Parenthesis* for them, as
p. 341. well as for the Heathens, (*as though there*
p. 706. *ever had been such Fools in the world*; or *if at least any considerable number of them ever did so?*) *Kissing* I see *goes by Favour*, and the *Heathens* are more beholden to him, than those of the *Church* of *Rome*, though he acknowledge it to be a *true Church, as holding all the Essential Points of Faith*. As for what you adde of them, that they do not take all the Arguments of the *Fathers* to be *Infallible demonstrations*, I think it

it very unreasonably applied to the present case. But am very well assured, your self cannot deny this to be an *Infallible demonstration*, viz, that the *Fathers*, while they would not admit the pretence of the *Heathens*, affirming they worshipped the *true God* under the name of *Iupiter*, but set themselues by such arguments, as they (poor men) were able, to confute it, did not themselues believe that *Iupiter* was the *true God*, which was what Dr. St. had undertaken to prove against T. G. Or else that they were not as he describes them, *Men of that Exemplary Piety, great Abilities, and Excellent Conduct and Magnanimity, as set them aboue the contempt and reproach of any but Infidels and Apostates*; when himself, as you haue seen, expose's them to the *contempt* and *reproach* of being *Vnequal Matches* to the *Heathen Achilleses*; or which is worse, down right *Prevaricators*. By this you see what a *Full account* the Dr. gives us of the *Sense* of the *Fathers* in this Point, when the greatest part of the Testimonies he brings reach no farther, than to prove that the *Heathens* had a natural Notion of *one Supream God*, or Ep. Dedic.

at most that it was the *Sense* of the *Heathens*, that *Iupiter* was He (all which I haue shown to be *Impertinent* to the Point in debate) and reproaches the *Fathers* for endeavouring to *disprove* them; which is as much, in *plain English*, as to tell us, that it was not *their Sense*, that *Iupiter* was the *true God*.

Cath. You are too rigorous, *Eunomius*, in tying vp an Author alwaies to the strict Method of *close arguing*. There is a *Liberty* to be given to Writers to make use some times of *Rhetorical Ornaments* and *Amplifications*. And such I take these passages cited by the Dr. to be, which though they come not home to the Question, and therefore are rejected by you as *Impertinent*; yet they serve to *illustrate* those *other* Testimonies, that do, of which the Dr. hath alledged good store out of the *Fathers*.

Eun: This is what I deny; and if you think fit to produce them, I do not doubt, but to make good my promise, that is, to shew, that either the *meaning* of the *Fathers* is *mis-represented*, or both their *words* and *Sense corrupted* by him.

Cathar. But before you proceed to

that, which I am well assured you will never make out, I would gladly receive satisfaction from you in a *Point* relating to our former discourse; viz, what *Judgment* your self make of the *Arguments* produced by the *Fathers* to convince the *Heathens* of *Idolatry*, and particularly of those from the *Poetical* Fables, which seem to me to be *Ironical* and *Trivial*, rather than *Serious* and *Solid*.

Eun: Could I transcribe the *Arguments* used by the *Fathers* vpon this Occasion, I durst leave them to speak for themselves at the Bar of your *Judgment*. But this would require *a Volume*, or rather many *Volumes* to do, they being well nigh *Infinite*. I shall therefore at present reduce so many of them as occurr to my Memory to some certain *General Heads*, from whence you may take a sufficient Prospect not only of the *Fathers* designs, and the *force* of their *Arguments*, but vpon what account also it was that they charged the *Heathens* with *Idolatry*. To do this with greater clearness, I must desire you to take notice, that as the *Heathens* had many kinds of *Gods* for the worship-

ping of which they were charged with *Idolatry*, so the *Fathers* had not *one* only sort of *Adversaries* to deal with, but *many*. And

Li. 6. de civ. Dei c. 5. & li. 4. c. 27. Euseb. li. 4. de Prap. Evang. in Praef.

First for the *Gods*, S. *Augustin* tells us out of *Varro*, and *Scævola* that the *Heathen's Theology* gaue a threefold account of them, the one *Fabulous*, used by the *Poets*; the 2d *Natural*, used by the *Philosophers*, and the 3d *Civil* used by the *Priests* and *People* in their publick worship. The first they said was accomodated to the *Theater*, the 2d to the *Philosophers*, the third to the *People*. But *S. Augustin* shows the *first* and the *last* viz, the *Fabulous* and the *Civil*, not to be well *distinguished*, because *the same Gods who were exposed to Derision in the Theaters, were proposed as Objects of Adoration in the Temples, and had Sacrifices offered to them.* So that in reality they had but *two* kinds of *Gods*, the *Fabulous* or *Civil* used by the *Priests* and *People*, and the *Natural* by the *Philosophers*. The *Former* of these were Originally *Dead men*, whom the People out of *flattery* or *Affection* had placed in heaven, and the *Images* erected to their memory; but consequently *Evil*

Arnob. li. 1. Tertull. Apol. c. 10. Lact. li. 1. c. 8. S. Aug. li. 8. de civ. Dei. c. 26. Cic.

Spirits, which as it were *incorporated* themſelves in the *Images*, and as *Minucius Felix* ſaith, *by exhibiting themſelves preſent in the Temples, inſpiring the Vates, animating the entrails of beaſts, governing the flight of birds, directing Lots to fall where they pleaſed, and the like Prodigious effects, gained to themſelves the Authority and Eſteem of Gods, aſſuming with all to themſelves*, as *Athenagoras* ſaith, *the ſame names with the Statues or Images in which they aſſiſted.* Hence the *Poets* took occaſion ſometimes to ſubject them to the *Paſſions* of *Men*, ſometimes to give them the *Titles* due only to the *true divinity*; *The Prieſts* alſo, to make a ſtrange mixture or confuſion of *Poetical Fables* and *Religious Ceremonies* in their publick worship, at once to delight and delude the People: And the *Philoſophers*, to invent new *Interpretations* to avoid the ſhame of thoſe *foul Practices*, which not only the *Poets*, but the *Hiſtorians* alſo attributed to them, as *Lactantius* ſhows. And this was the Origen of that ſort of *Gods* which they called *Fabulous* or *Civil*, firſt the favour of the *People*, and then the

li. 2. de nat. Deo.

Vid. S. Aug. de civ. Dei li. 8. c. 22. p. 66.

S. Aug. li. 4. de civ. Dei. c. 27. 32.

Lact. li. 1. c. 2. & 11. S. Aug. li. 1. de conſ. Evang. c. 23.

deluſion of wicked *Spirits*.

The 2d kind, which they called *Natural*, had for it's Object the parts of the Vniverſe, as the *Sun*, *Moon*, and *Starrs*, the *Fire*, the *Ayr*, the *Earth* &.

Def. p. 15. And although it be appropriated to the *Philoſophers*, yet as Dr. St. himſelf tells us out of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *there were Several Nations, that deſpiſed Images, and worshipped the Several parts of the Vniverſe, and the Symbols of them, as the Scythians, Sarmatians, Perſians, and Macedonians*, (among whom the *Ægyptians* may be reckoned for that *part* of their Religion, which concerned the worship of *creatures*) *whom the ſaid Clemens makes to haue been the Philoſopher's Maſters in the worship of theſe Inferiour Elements, which were made to be Serviceable to men; And then reckons* up other *Philoſophers, that worshipped* the *Starrs, as animated Beings; Others the Planets and the World, and the Stoicks who ſaid*, God *paſſed through the meaneſt parts of Matter*. If you ask from whence this kind of *Idolatry* took it's riſe, *Voſſius*, *De Idol. Præfat.* as you heard before aſſigns it to the *Ignorance* and *Inadvertency* of men, in

not distinguishing the Divine Power which is from God, from that other which is in God, and therefore from the wonderful works which they discovered in nature, concluded Nature it self to be God, and the parts of it also to be Deities, (very agreably to what the Author of the Book of *Wisdome* relateth of this matter in his 13th Chapter) though both the said *Vossius* and Others adde many other *impulsive* Causes which concurred to plunge the *Heathens* in this kind of *Idolatry*; among which *Lactantius* maketh the chief to be the *Devil*, *who being alwaies an Enemy to Truth, takes pleasure in the Errours of men, and makes it his continual and only busineſſ to pour darkneſſ upon their minds, and blind their Understandings, that they may not look up to Heaven.* Li. 2. c. 1.

These things premised, it follows clearly that as the *Theology* of the *Heathens* (if I may so call it) was manifold, so the *ways* of *defending* their worship were *divers*; and consequently the *Arguments* produced by the *Fathers* against them could not be all of *one* kind, but must needs be *different* proportionably to the *Subjects* they were to treat of.

Hence when they were to impugn *thoſe* who worshipped the *Images* for *Gods*, they argued from the *vileneſſ* and *Impotency* of the *matter*, of which they were made, from the nature of the *Artificer* that made them, the *Indignities* they ſuſtained from the *vileſt* of creatures, as Bats *Flyes*, *Spiders* &c. their having *eyes*, but *not ſeing*, *Ears*, but *not hearing* &c. And *theſe Arguments* I hope you will grant did conclude that for which they were brought, viz, that the *Idols* or *Images* of the *Heathens* were *not Gods*.

Cathar. You need not doubt of it at all: I readily grant them to be *abſolutely concluſive*. But withall I muſt tell you that I think you haue brought your ſelf by your defending the *Image-worship* of the *Church* of *Rome*, into a *ſnare* out of which you will not eaſily get free: viz, that you will be forced to grant the aforeſaid *Arguments* to be altogether as *concluſive* againſt the *Images* of that *Church*: for the *Abſurdities* objected agree every Jot as well to *them*, as to the *Images* of the *Heathens*, as the Dr. hath very well obſeru'd: *They* alſo are made of *wood* or *ſtone* or *metal*, haue

eyes

eyes and *ſee not*, *eares* and *hear not* &c.

Eun. But this with your leaue, *Catharinus*, I shall deny, viz that the *Arguments* of the Fathers are equally *concluſive* againſt the *Images* of the *Church* of *Rome*, as againſt thoſe of the *Heathens*; and I think it no hard matter to free my ſelf of this *ſnare*. For the *Fathers* did not found their Arguments meerly vpon the *matter* of the Images, and the *Art* of the Artificers; but vpon theſe *two conditions* conjointly taken, viz, that they were held to be *Gods*, and neverthe leſſ took their *Being* from *wood*, or *ſtone*, or ſome kind of *mettal*, and the *Art* of the Workman, whereas *thoſe* of the *Church* of *Rome* do not belieue their *Images* to be *Gods*, nor *worship* them as ſuch, as the *Heathens* did. And therefore it was but a *Slip-knot* which the Dr. tied, when he *ſuppreſſed* the *former* of theſe conditions, viz, that the *Heathens* held their Images to be *Gods*, and applied the reproaches of the *Latter* to the *Images* of the *Church* of *Rome*, which, as you your ſelf know very well, declares *it belieues no divinity to be in them, for which they ought to be* Concil. Trent. Seſſ. 25.

worshipped.

Cathar. This I confeſſ *alters* the caſe ſomething, *if here ever were ſuch Fools in the world who worshipped their Images as Gods, or if at leaſt any conſiderable number of the Heathens ever did ſo*, which I perceive is no *Article* of *Faith* with Dr. St.

Def. 7. 541. P. 706.

Eun: Yet nothing, as you know very well, is more *plain* and *Expreſſ* in *Scripture*, than that they did ſo. And becauſe the Dr. is ever now and then caſting in *Parentheſes* to inſinuate the contrary, it will not be amiſſ to repeat a few of the many *Texts*, that occurr in it: as Levit. 19. 4. *Turn ye not unto Idols, nor make to your ſelves Molten Gods.* 2. Kings. 19. 18. *They haue caſt the Gods of the Nations into the Fire for they were no God, but the work of mens hands, wood and ſtone*; *All the Gods of the Nations are Idols* Iſai. 44. 16. 17. *He* (i ē the Carpenter) *burneth part of the wood in the Fire &c. And the reſidue thereof he maketh a God, even his Graven Image: He falleth down unto it, and worshippeth it, and prayeth unto it, and ſaith, deliver me, For thou art my God.* The ſame is avowed by the Prophet *Jeremy*.

Pſ. 69. 5.

2. 27. *They have said, to a stock, Thou art my Father, and to a stone, Thou hast brought me forth.* With them agrees the *Author* of the Book of *Wisdom*, (if you think he may be credited) when he saith ch. 14. *that One preparing to sail, calleth upon a peice of wood more rotten than the Vessel that carrieth him*; and again. c. 15. v. 15. *They counted all the Idols of the Heathens to be Gods*, In fine the chief argument which *Demetrius* the *Silver-smith*. Acts. 19. 26. availed himself of to raise a tumult against S. *Paul* at *Ephesus*, was to tell those of *like occupation* with him, *that he perswaded and turned away much people saying, that they be no Gods, which are made with hands.* And can any thing be said more *expressly*, than it is in these places that the *Heathens* worshipped their Molten *Images*, as *Gods?* surely if Dr. Still's words, when he saith, *It cannot enter into his mind how God should have declared a thing by more Expresse and Emphatical words, than he hath done*, may be applied without temerity to *any* Texts of *Scripture*, it may be to *these*: And therefore if Scripture be the *Rule* of his *Faith*, and his meaning be

Expreſſ Scripture when it is to be had, I ſee not but it ought to be an *Article* of *Faith* with him, that the *Heathens*, (not an *inconſiderable number* of them neither, but the *Generality* of them) worshipped their *Images* as *Gods*. This I dare affirm, that He that ſees it not plainly affirmed in *theſe* Texts of *Scripture*, (to which I could adde many out of the *Fathers* no leſſ cleer and Expreſſ,) muſt haue no better *eyes* than the *Images* themſelues. But Dr. St. is none of thoſe, for in the very place (*p.* 700.) where he thruſts in that kind *Parentheſis* (*if at leaſt any conſiderable number of the Heathens ever did ſo*) ſpeaking of *the Idolaters who worshipped their Images as Gods*, he tells us *it was upon this account, that they ſuppoſed ſome Spirit to be incorporated in the Image, and ſo to make together with it a Perſon fit to receive worship*. And here though he cite not ſo much as a *Covie of one Father*, yet I shall do him that right as to acknowledge he ſpeaks *their Senſe*; yet cannot but queſtion his *Sincerity*, who when he knew that the *Arguments* of the *Fathers* againſt the *Images* of the *Heathens*, taken from

S. Iren. li. 3. c. 6. S. Cypr. li. 3. ad Quir. Arnob. li. 1. min. Fel. in Oct. S. Aug. in Pſ. 41. & li. 2. q. ſup. Exod q. 71. S. Cyril. li. 6. cont. Jul.

S. Aug. li. 2. de civ. Dei. c. 23. 26. Arnob. li. 1. adv. Gent. Euſeb. li. 3. de vita Conſt. S. Athan.

the *vileneſſ* of the *matter* of which they were made, &c. went all vpon this Suppoſition (at length too acknowledged by himſelf) viz, that the *Heathens* held them to be *Gods*; could yet throw all the ſame reproaches vpon the *Images* of the *Church* of *Rome*, which he knows expreſsly denies *anydivinity to be in them*, for himſelf relates the very words of the *Council* of *Trent* in which it is denied.

Orat. cont. Gent. S. Chryſoſt. in Genethl. apud Theodoret. Dial. 1.

Def. p. 613.

Cathar. I confeſſ I know not what can be oppoſed to ſuch *expreſſ* Texts of *Scripture*. And therefore granting the *Arguments* of the *Fathers* to have been concluſive againſt the *firſt* ſort of *Idolaters* who worshipped their *Images* as *Gods*, I deſire you to proceed to the reſt.

Eun: But firſt for the ſame reaſon, you muſt grant *them* alſo not to be *concluſive* againſt *thoſe*, who do *not* worship *them* as *Gods*.

Cathar. Pray content your ſelf,) Good *Eunomius*) with what I haue granted in relation to the *Heathens*, and proceed in your deſigned Diſcourſe.

Eun: I ſhall obey you The *Generality* of the *Heathens*, and their publickly-authorized worship being thus beat

down by the Arguments of the *Fathers*, some of Dr. Sts. *Wiser ones* came in to their ayd, and affirmed, that they did not worship the *Images* as *Gods*, but the *Deities* represented by them. To this the *Fathers* returned, that *Jupiter* himself and the rest of that rabble were Originally *Men*: that they had *Fathers* and *Mothers*, and *Vnkles*, and *Aunts*, as other mortals haue: that the Places of their *Birth* were known, their *Sepulchers* extant, and their Practices known to be such, as showed them to be *Monsters* or *devils*, rather than *Men*. And when the *Heathens* to remove these reproaches from their *Gods*, and from themselves replied, that these were the *Fictions* of the *Poets*: The *Fathers* proved the Pretence to be false. 1. From the *common belief* of the *Heathens*, who acknowledged *Jupiter* to be the Son of *Saturn* and *Ops*. *Æsculapius* to be the Son of *Apollo* &c. 2ly From the nature of *Poetrie*, which is not to *invent* downright *lyes*, but to set off things that were done, with certain *Artificial* Representations; as also from the *Intention* of the *Poets*, which certainly was not to *defame* their *Gods*, but to adde

Lact. li. 1. c. 11.

Lactan. li. 1. c 11.

S. Aug. li. 1. de cons. Evang. c. 23. & S. Athanas. orat.

lustre to their *Actions* by the Additional advantage of some *counterfeit colours*: By which it appears that in reality, they were not the *Actions* of *Iupiter* and the rest, which were the *Fictions* of the *Poets*, but the *Titles* they gaue to them as *Gods*, and to him as the *Supream God*, as *Lactantius* shows by many Examples. And here I cannot omit to give you the *words* of *S. Athanasius* vpon this subject they are so full to the purpose, *Some of the Heathens*, saith he, *are wont to affirm, that the Poets lye when they relate any wicked actions of the Gods: but that in setting forth their Praises they do not faign, but speak truth, as when they give to Iupiter the titles of Father of the Gods, and of Supream, and Celestial, and make him raign in heaven.* This I hope is just as the Dr. would haue it; But what saith *S. Athanasius*? *That not only himself* (a man of so much vnderstanding, as he was) *but every man of common Sense will easily see this very reason principally to make against them. For Truth will again defend it self against them with the former demonstrations, I haue brought; because the Actions indeed convince them to haue been men; but the Praises tran-*

Lact. S. Athan. contr. Gent.

Lact. Sup. Cit.

Orat. contr. Gent.

ſcend the meaſure of Human Nature. But theſe two are contrary and inconſiſtent with each other: For neither is it proper for Celeſtial Gods to doe ſuch things, nor lawfull to Supplicate ſuch Gods as do them. What then remains to be underſtood but that the Praiſes were falſe, and faigned out of Flattery, but that the Actions were truly delivered to their perpetual ſhame. And this the common cuſtome eaſily ſhows to be true: For there is hardly any one to be found, who intending to praiſe others, accuſes their life and manners; but rather extolls them with praiſes to hide the foulneſſ and wickedneſſ of their actions. 3dly From the *Relations* of their own moſt *Ancient* and moſt Authentick *Hiſtorians.* 4thly From the Judgment of the moſt *learned* among them, as *Varro*, *Scævola*, *Cicero*, &c. 5thly From the *Images* of their *Gods* and *Goddeſſes* in their Temples, particularly that of *Juno*, as *ſiſter* and *Wife* to *Jupiter* and of *Jupiter* himſelf with an *Eagle* at his feet carrying *Ganimede* vpon his back. Laſtly from the Plays which were inſtituted for their worship, in which thoſe very debaucheries were repreſented in honour of them. Theſe I take to

Lact. Aid. S. Aug. li. 1. de conſ. Evang. c. 23.

S. Aug. li. 4. de civ. Del. c. 23.

Lact. in Loc. cit.

S. Aug. li. 1. de conſ. Evang. c. 23. & de civ. Dei. li. 4. c. 30.

S. Aug.

cleer and ſolid Convictions, that *Jupiter* and the reſt whom they commonly worshipped were not *Gods*, but *Men* and the moſt wicked of *Men*. And therefore. *li. 4. de Civ. Dei. c. 26.*

The *Philoſophers* to ward off the blow, took another way, which was to turn the *Gods* with their *Images*, and the *Stories* related of them to *Natural* and *Myſtical Interpretations*, as that by *Jupiter* they meant the *Fire*, by *Juno* the *Ayr*, by *Neptune* the *Sea*, &c. But here alſo the *Fathers* show'd evidently from the very *Interpretations* which themſelves gaue, that they did not ſerve *Creator*, but the *Creatures*, viz, the *Fire*, *Ayr*, *water*, &c. And when others, who thought themſelves yet more *learned* and *Wiſe* pretended that they did not worship either the *Images*, or the *Creatures* which they ſaid were ſignified by them, but the *Inviſible Deities* which reſided in the one, and preſided over the Other, the *Fathers* evinced thoſe ſuppoſed *Deities* to be no other than *Wicked Spirits* or *devils*, from their exacting *Sacrifice* to be offered to them which was *due* only to *God*, and commanding *Obſcene Plays* to be repre- *Athenag. Legat. p. 66. S. Aug. de conſ. Evang. li. 1. c. 23. & li. 20. cont. Fauſt. c. 9. 19.* *S. Aug. in Pſ. 96. & 113. & li. 4. de civ. Dei.*

sented in their *honour*. And for *Jupiter* in particular they proved him not to be the *true God*, (as Dr. St. would haue him thought to be) 1. From the Testimony of *Nature* forcing the very *Heathens* in the midst of their *Idolatries* in all their dangers or necessities to recurr to *God*, not to *Jupiter*. 2. From the *Altars* they erected and *Sacrifices* they offered to the *Vnknown God* in time of *Earth-quakes* &c, the manner whereof is related by *Agellius*. 3. From the *Contradictions* they run themselves into, who made him to be the *Supream God*, as when *Virgil* (*who*, as you heard before, *was so Nice and exact in all matters that concerned their Religion, as if he had been Pont. Max.*) gives him the Title of *Father Almighty*, and at the same time makes him to be the *Æther*, and to haue a *Wife* also.

Tunc Pater Omnipotens fœcundis imbribus Æther
Conjugis in gremium læta descendit.

And *Plautus* in like manner in the same verse makes him to be the *Supream God*, and an *Adulterer* when speaking of *Alcumena* he saith.

Vtrinque gravida & ex viro & ex
Summo Jove.

c. 26. & li. 10. c. 4.

Tertull. de Testim. Animæ.

Minuc. Fel. p. 17. Agell li. 2. c. 28. apul. Voss li. 1 de Idol. c. 2.

—— Et hic nunc intus hic cum illa cubat.

4. From the filthy and *abominable Actions* he not only permitted, but *exacted* to be *represented* in his *honour*. And lastly from the *Confession* of *Jupiter* himself, that he was a *devil*, as you heard before out of *Minucius Felix* and *Tertullian*. And I take his *own* Testimony in this matter to *out-weigh* all those of the *Poets* and *Orators* cited by Dr. St. S. Aug. li. 2. de civ. c. 13. & li. 4. c. 26.

As for those who seriously and soberly asserted *one Supream Being, Creator and Governour of the world, Invisible, unbegotten, Omnipotent* &c. but called him by the name of *Jupiter*, the *Fathers* 1st Proved by the above said and other Arguments, that it was not *He* who was worshipped in the *Capitol*, as you haue heard; and then condemned them not only as *absurd* in so doing, but as *contumelious* and *Impious* for applying to the *true God* the name of so abominable a Wretch, whether *man* or *devil* Lastly they justly charged even *Plato* himself and the rest of them, at least with external Idolatry for concurring with the Vulgar in the worship of *many Gods*. And the matter of fact Orig. cont. Cels. li. 4. & 5. Lact. li. 1. c. 11. S. Aug. li. 4. de civ. Dei. c. 27. S. Aug. li. 10. de civ. Dei. c. 3.

is confesſed by *Voſſius*.

Li. 1. de Idol. c. 4. p. 12. 13. & li. 2. c. 41. p. 151.

And now, *Catharinus*, I hope by this time you ſee, that which way ſoever the *Heathens* turned themſelves they were unanſwerably confuted by the *Fathers*; And the very *Sequel* makes it manifeſt, viz, the *Subverſion* of all the Severall kinds of *Idolatry*, and the *Converſion* of the world to *Chriſtianity*, which certainly had never followed had the Fathers been ſuch *unequal Matches* to the *Wiſer Heathens*, and their arguments even thoſe from the *Poetical Fables* to weak and frivolous as Dr St. would haue them thought to haue been, that he might eſtab ish *Jupiter Capitolinus* in the *throne* of the *Supream God*.

Li. 2. de civ. Dei. c. 13. & li. 4. c. 26. 27. 28. & li. 6. c. 6.

For, as *S. Auguſtin* ſaith, if thoſe *relations* were *true*, they prove him to haue been a moſt *wicked man*; and if they were *Falſe*, and only faigned by the *Poets*, they prove him to be a *devil*, who exatted and took delight to haue ſuch abominable practices aſcribed to him and repreſented in his honour.

Cath. I cannot but thank you for this *Short*, yet *cleer Account* you haue given me of the *Heathens Theology*, and the Several ways which the *Fathers* took to

refute it. Had you deduced the whole matter at large, cited the *Passages* of the *Fathers*, and dilated vpon them with your own *Animadversions*, I think you might haue out done the Dr. himselfe in being *Voluminus*. Yet whilst you studied *brevity*, me thinks there is one *Principal* part of it omitted by you; And that is *Varro's* Opinion who believed the *same God* to be worshipped by the *Jews* and the *Romans*, as *S. Augustin* confesseth, but *under another name*, and with this difference, that the *Romans* worshipped him by an *Image*, but the *Jews* would admit of no *Image* in his Worship. *Li 4. de civ. Dei. c. 9. & li. 1. de Cons. Evang. c. 22.*

Eun: You haue done well to mind me of this, because he was, (as the same *S. Augustin* calleth him) *the most Acute and learned of all the Romans*. And if such a man erred, much more may we think the Vulgar did. Now that what he asserted was not true, *S. Augustin* shows by Arguments which cannot be answered. 1. Because the *Romans*, who received the *Gods* of other Nations whom they had conquered, would never admit into their Religion the worship of the *God* of the *Jews*. 2. Because the *God* of the *Jews* forbad any other *Gods* to be *S. Aug. de Cons. Evang. li. 1. c. 17. 18. Ibid. c. 18, & 22.*

worshipped besides him; but *Iupiter* forbad not even *Saturn* himself, and that, after he had driuen him out of his kingdome, to be worshipped as a *God*, though he stood in competition with him for the Title of *Supream*; as being thought by others to be the *God* of the *Iewes*, and that *Deity*, into whom the *Philosophers* resolved their *Interpretations*. 3. Because, had the *Romans* believed *Iupiter* to be the same with the *God* of the *Iewes*, they would not haue treated him so contumeliously at *Rome*, as to make a *Simulacre* to him. Perhaps you will check at the new-fashioned word *Simulacre*, but you must know, first that it comes from *France* where it is in use, among Authors of great note. 2. That the *fashion* of it is the same with that of *Spectre*, used by Dr. St. p. 682. and 3. That the word *Simulachrum* seems to be used here by *S. Augustin* in the *common* acception of the *Heathens*, that is, for such an *Image* as by Dedication was believed by them to haue some *diuinity* incorporated in it, for *which* it ought to be worshipped, and the making *such* an one to *Iupiter*, had the *Romans* believed him to be the same with

Ibid. c. 22. 23.

Id. li. 4. de ciu. Dei. c. 9.

the God of the *Jews* is what as *S. Auguſtin* ſaith, would haue been a *contumely* to him. 4. Becauſe *Varro*, who, had he been free from the preiudice of *cuſtome* which involved him alſo in the worship of *many Gods*, would haue aſſerted the Worship of *one only God*, and that without a *Simulacre*, yet himſelf believed and taught this God to be no other than *the Soul of the world*, whereas the *true God*, as *S. Auguſtin* replyes vpon him, was not *the Soul of the world*, (if there were any ſuch thing) but *the Maker and Creator of it*. And then lamenting as it were that ſo great a man should come ſo *neer the Truth*, and miſſ it, he expreſſes that favourable Opinion of him, that *had he been adverti ſed of the Mutability of a Soul*, together with the *Impious* and *Irreligious* Conſequences, which followed from his Aſſertion, and could haue born vp againſt the Tyranny of an *old Errour, he would in all likelyhood much rather haue believed that "Inconmutable Being, which created the Soul it ſelf, to be the true God.* And with theſe and the like Arguments he

Ibid. cap. 31.

S. Aug. de conſ. Evang. li. 1. c. 23.

Li. 4. c. 12.

XUM

triumphed over that great *Dictator* of the *Romans* in all kind of learning.

Cathar. These Arguments indeed seem to me convincing. But I am yet to seek, whether these and the rest also produced by the Fathers may not be looked vpon by Dr. St. as *casts of their former employment*, when he so earnestly maintains *Jupiter Capitolinus* to be the *true God*; and I doubt whether they would haue had the same succeſſ, had *he* been then alive to manage the *Cauſe*.

Eun: You may think as you pleaſe of the Dr's wit and abilities in this Point. But thus much I think is evident to any man of Common Senſe, that if the *Fathers* did not moſt groſsly contradict themſelves, or were not (to uſe the Dr's Phraſe) ſuch *a pack of Hypocrites and Impoſtors*, as to impugn in others what they believed themſelves, the Paſſages alledged by him out of them, to show it to haue been *their Senſe*, that *Jupiter* who was worshipped in the *Capitol* was the *true God*, muſt be *miſ-repreſented*, or *corrupted* by him.

Def. p. 494.495.

Cathar.

Cathar. That if you pleaſe ſhall be tried at our next meeting.

Eun: Pray pick out the choiceſt and moſt convincing Teſtimonies you can. For you know, as the Dr. himſelf hath told us, that *this Point is very material toward the true underſtanding the nature of Idolatry.* Def. p. 24.

Cathar. You need not recommend that to my care, I ſhall give you enow to make *a full conſent* of the *Fathers.*

THE THIRD DIALOGVE.

THE ARGVMENT.

THe *Particular Teſtimonies of* Minucius Felix, Clemens Alexandrinus, S. Auguſtin, and Tertullian, *cited by Dr. St. to prove it to haue been* their Senſe, *that the Heathen's Jupiter was the true* God, *brought to the Teſt; And the deſign of the ſaid Fathers shown to be either* mis-repreſented, *or both their Words and Senſe* corrupted *by him.*

CATHARINVS, EVNOMIVS.

Evn: Good morrow, *Catharinus*: I ſee you are breaking your *Faſt* this morning with the Dr. Haue you met with the *Places* you deſired.

Cath. I haue, though with more difficulty, than I imagined, they were ſo

intermingled with those other passages, which as you observed, proved no more, than either that *the Heathens acknowledged one Supream God*: or that it was the Sense of the *Heathens*, that *their Jupiter* was *He*. Yet I haue met with *some*, and those of great Authority, which prove it so clearly to haue been the *Sense* of the *Fathers* also, that *Jupiter* was the *Supream God*, that I think it cannot be denied.

Eun: And was it not artificially done of the Dr. to *in-lay* his Testimonies in such a manner, that the unwary Reader, hearing the *Supream God* spoken of in some of them, and *Jupiter* in others, might think the *Fathers* acknowledged *Jupiter* to be the *Supream God*. But this is what I deny. And doubt not before we part to make you see, either that the meaning of the *Fathers* is *mis-represented*, or both their *words* and *Sense corrupted* by him. You may produce them if you please.

Cath. Well then *Eunomius*, what can be more clear than the Testimony of *Minucius Felix*? when he saith (and as Dr. St. observes) *wisely* in this case. *They who make Iove the chief God*, *Def. p. 8.*

are only deceived in the name, but agree in the Power. Surely *he was farr enough from thinking their Iupiter Father of Gods and Men (which he applauds the Poets for saying) to haue been the Arch-Devil.*

Eun: This indeed comes something more home to the purpose, if it be true what the Dr. saith. But what if he haue *corrupted* both the Sense and words of *Minucius*, to make him speak as he would haue him? To make this out, there will need no more, than to acquaint you with the design of *Minucius* in that place, and to set down his words exactly as they are in the *Oxford* Edition 1631. His design was there to convince the *Heathens*, that the world was governed by *one* only God, not *many*. To do this he makes use of the Examples of *Monarchical* Government among *men*, of *one king* among the *Bees*, and *one* Leader amongst the *heards* of Irrational Creatures: from whence he inferrs, that much more ought we to acknowledge *one Supream and undivided Power in Heaven.* This he confirms again from the Practice of the *Heathens* them-

p. 51. 52. 53. 54.

ſelves, *who were wont to lift up their hands to heaven, and ſay, God is Great, and God is true.* And then addes for their further Conviction, the words (as they ſhould haue been) cited by the Dr. viz, *Thoſe alſo who will haue Iupiter to be the Prince or Chief, are deceiued in the name, but agree as to the Vnity of Power: I hear the Poets alſo extolling One Father of Gods and Men.* By which it is plain, that himſelf intended nothing leſſe than to aſſert *Iupiter* to be the one *Supream God*; but that he argued only *ad hominem* (as we ſay) from what the wiſer *Heathens* pretended they thought of *Iupiter*, that they ought to acknowledge, but *One Supream God*, Maker and Governour of the world. As for his own thoughts concerning *Iupiter*, you haue heard before what they were, p. 89. where he expreſsly affirms *Saturn, Serapis, and Iupiter himſelf to be Deuils*; and proues them to be ſo from their own *Confeſſions*. So farr was He from thinking the *Heathen's Iupiter* to be the *Supream God*, as Dr. St. would make his Reader believe; which he could not otherwiſe do, than by *corrupting* the

very Text. For the words in *Minucius* are theſe. *Et qui Iovem Principem volunt, falluntur in nomine, ſed de una poteſtate conſentiunt*, that is, *Thoſe alſo who will haue Iupiter to be the Prince or Chief, are deceiued in the name, but agree as to the Vnity of Power*, i. é. that there is *one* Supream God by whom the world is governed: and not as they are translated by the Doctor. *They who make Iove the Chief God, are only deceiued in the name, but agree in the Power.* Where if you compare the *Engliſh* with the *Latin*, you will find, that firſt he translates the word *Volunt* (by which *Minucius* intimates *what* the *Heathens* would haue, but he would not grant,) by the term *make*, as if *Minucius* aſſented to it. Then he coggs the word *ONLY* into the Text, *They are* only ſaith he *deceiued in the name*, as if the *name* did not carry the *Perſon* along with it in his Judgment who makes *Iupiter* to be a *Devil*: And laſtly leaues out the word *VNA*, ſcil *poteſtate*, which plainly shew'd the deſign and Senſe of *Minucius* to be, that although they were deceived in their pretence of aſſigning *Iupiter* to

be the *Supream God*; yet by what they affirmed of him, viz, that He was the *Prince* or *Chief*, and the *Poets* setting forth *one Father of Gods* and *Men*, they were sufficiently convinced, that they ought to acknowledge but *one Supream* and *un-divided Power*, not many, by which the world was made and governed; which was the *Point* that *Minucius* was proving in that place. Here then you see, *Catharinus*, that the Dr. hath not only *mis-represented* the meaning of *Minucius*, but *corrupted* the very *Text*, by *puting in* and *leaving* out what he thought might make for his advantage. Neither doth he applaud the *Poets* for their magnifying *Jupiter as the Father of Gods and men*, but cites them against the *Heathen's* Opinion of *Plurality* of *Gods*, as acknowledging *one* Father of All. The Dr. observes that what *Minucius* said was *wisely* said; and so it was, because he convinced the *Heathens*, by the Testimony of those who were esteemed the *wisest* amongst them: But whether it were *Wisely* or *Honestly* done of him thus to *corrupt* the *words* and *Sense* of *Minucius*, I leave to your Judgment; But am very

ſure, that this is not the way to break T. G. of his *bad cuſtome.*

Defence p. 77. 78.

Cath. But the following Teſtimony of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, who allows and *applauds* the *Heathens* for giving to *Iupiter* the Title of the *Supream God*, both in his Admonition and Miſcellanies, may I hope ſerve to do it. For having shown that *Thales confeſſed God's Omnipotency and Omniſciency, that Epicharmus attributed Omnipotency to him, and Homer the Creation of the world, which he deſcribed in the Shield of Achilles*, he makes this *Obſervation*, (*as if it were purpoſely intended ſaith he for T. G.*) *He that is called both in Verſe and Proſe Iupiter carries our apprehenſion to God*, (*not to the Arch-Devil as T. G. ſaith.*) *And then cites the Teſtimonies of Euphorion and Æſchilus about Iupiter, which for T. G's better information* he ſets down both in Greek and English, viz, *Iupiter is Æther and Earth and Heaven and all things, and if there be any thing aboue all, Iupiter is it: Which Clemens is ſo farr from thinking an improper ſpeech, that he ſaith it was ſpoken with a great deal of decency and*

Gravity concerning God. And now I pray tell me, *Eunomius*, if Dr. St. had not a great deal of reaſon to ſubjoyn as he doth; *By this it appears that thoſe who boaſt ſo much of the Fathers are not over-converſant with them; but Father Bellarmin, and Father Coccius ſerve them for a whole Jury of them.* And then *commends T. G. for his modeſty, that when he had ſaid, this was the Senſe of the Fathers, he produced no more but good Father Origen; and is ſo kind-hearted to him, that though I believe*, ſaith the Dr. *he hath heard how he hath been condemned for an Heretick, yet he with great judgment ſuppoſes that what he ſaid was the Common Senſe of the Fathers.* What ſay you to this *Eunomius*.

Eun: That we haue here a *Second Part* to the ſame *tune*, or another *Fit* of ranting like that of the *two God fathers*, and *Covie* of one, But what hath *Clemens* done either in his *Admonition* or *Miſcellanies* to put the Dr. into it? He ſaith indeed that what the *Poets* ſay about *Jupiter's* being *all things*, was ſpoken with a great deal of *decency* and *gravity* concerning *God*, and that

He who is called both in *Verſe* and *Proſe Iupiter*, doth under the glorious Titles Attributed to him of *Omnipotent*, *Omniſcient* &c. carry our Apprehenſion to *God*; but doth it follow from hence, that it was the *Senſe* of *Clemens* himſelf that *Iupiter* who was worshipped in the *Temples*, was *that true God*? Cannot I ſay, it was ſpoken with a great deal of *decency* and *Gravity* by Dr. St. of *himſelf*, that *his deſign*, as he ſaith, *is to repreſent the matters in difference truly, to report faithfully, and to argue cloſely*, and that theſe things ſpoken of him carry *my Apprehenſion* to an *Ingenuous* and *Sincere* Writer of *Controverſy*, but it muſt be *my Senſe*, that Dr. St. of whom they are ſaid, muſt be *the Man*? This was the caſe of *Clemens*. His deſign in his *Admonition* was (and the Dr. could not be ignorant of it, for he cites the words) to ſhew that *there is a certain Divine Influence diſtilled upon all men, eſpecially on thoſe who apply themſelves to learning, by vertue of which they are forced to confeſs One God, incorruptible and unbegotten, who abides for ever above the higheſt Heavens*. And in the Fifth

Praef. to Rom. Idol.

Def. p. 96.

Book of his Miſcellanies he falls upon the ſame Subject again, viz, that *there is a Natural knowledge of one Omnipotent God among all conſidering men.* For proof whereof he cites many paſſages of the *Philoſophers* and *Poets*, and ſome of them applying to him under the name of *Iupiter*, *thoſe things* which truely and only belong to the *One Supream God*: From whence he draws this *Concluſion* at the End of the Book, that *the Eaſt and Weſt, the North and South have one and the ſame inbred notion of the Government of one Supream Diſpoſer of things. But farr more the Inquiſitive Philoſophers of Greece, who attribute a Wiſe Providence to him who is Inviſible, and the only moſt Powerful, and moſt Skilful Contriver of things.* By which it appears, that when *Clemens* ſaid, that He who is called *Iupiter* both in *Verſe* and *Proſe* carries our Apprehenſion to *God*, and that what *Æſchilus* ſaid of *Iupiter's* being *all things* was ſpoken with a great deal of *decency* and *gravity* concerning *God*; his meaning was not to aſſert *Iupiter* to be that *Supream Being*; but from the *Epithets* and *Titles* of *Omniſcient*, *Omnipotent*

&c. (Which their own *Philosophers* and *Poets* attributed to *Iupiter*, or to *God* under his name,) to convince them, that there was but *one only Supream Being*, Maker and Governour of the World. For, whether they did *Wisely* or no in calling him *Iupiter*, yet the things they said of him, did evidently oblige them to acknowledge such a *Being* to be the Contriver and disposer of all things; not that *Clemens* himself asserted them to belong to the *Iupiter*, who was worshipped by them: As (to make use of the former Paralel) when Dr. St. ascribes to himself, *Fidelity*, *Exactness*, *Closeness in arguing &c.* whether he do *wisely* or no in doing so (of which by this time you may have some cause to doubt) yet most certainly it follows from his applying *them* to himself that he acknowledges *them* to be the *true* and *laudable Qualities of a Controvertist*; not that I who cite *him* saying so of *himself*, acknowledge *them* to be found in *him*: For I think I haue evinc'd the *contrary* by many Arguments already, and foresee if you hold on in your design, I shall haue occasion to do it farther. As for the Judgment

which *Clemens* himself made of the Heathen's *Iupiter*, you heard before, how he affirms not only the *lesser Gods* to be *Devils*, but the more *Honourable* among them, viz, *Apollo*, *Diana*, *Latona*, *Ceres*, *Proserpina*, *Pluto*, *Hercules*, *and* (*as though it were purposely intended for Dr. St.*) *ipse Iupiter* even *Iupiter* himself, to be *Magni Dæmones*, *Great Devils*, and not that *He was the true God*, *Blessed for evermore*, as Dr. St. saith. Here perhaps the Dr. will say, that *Clemens runs out after his way*; because he runs not the *same way* with him. But by what hath been said it appears, that they who *boast* so much of giving a *full account* of the *Fathers*, are not *over-conversant* with them, unless the meaning be that they are *too bold* with them, in making them speak quite *contrary* to their meaning as the Dr. doth here with *Clemens*. Are there any more, whom you think fit to produce?

p. 296.

Def. p. 75.

Cathar. I know not what to say to these things, unless I should take the pains my self to *examin* the *Books*, which I *think* I shall not do.

Eun: And *so* did Dr. St. too; other-

wise he would never haue given us *such a full account* of them, as he hath. But pray tell me, Are there any *more*, whom you think fit to produce?

Def. p. 44. *Cath.* Yes: The Great *S. Augustin*, in his 4th Book of the *City* of God. cap. 9. where, as Dr. St. saith, *he confesses that the Romans believed him whom they worshipped in the Capitol to be the King of the Gods as well as Men: And to represent that, they placed a Scepter in his hand, and built his Temple upon a high Hill; and that it is he of whom Virgil saith, Jovis omnia plena; and the same in Varro's Opinion that was worshipped by some without an Image, by whom he same S. Augustin saith, he meant the Iews.* Can you deny these to be the *words* of S. *Augustin*? And if not, can any thing be more plain?

Eun: What to do? To prove it to be the *Sense* of *S. Augustin*, that *Jupiter* whom the *Romans* worshipped in the *Capitol*, was the *true God*? This I deny. They prove indeed that the *Heathens* endeavoured to save themselves from the shame of worshipping a *Devil* by these pretended Arguments; But what is that to the *Question*, which is not what was the *Sense* of the *Heathens*, but of the *Fathers*?

Cath. You are very preciſe I ſee in keeping to the *State* of the *Queſtion*.

Eun. And it is but neceſſary, when if a *Father* chance, (though but by way of an Objection, as theſe *words* of S. *Auguſtin* are) to cite the Teſtimony of a *Poet* or *Philoſopher*, wherein they either *prophanely* aſcribed to *Jupiter* the Attributes of the *true God*, or *fondly* and *abſurdly* applied to the *true God* the name of *Jupiter*, preſently it muſt be believed that the *Fathers* acknowledged *Jupiter* that was worshipped in the *Capitol*, to be the *true God*. But *S. Auguſtin* was ſo farr from thinking him ſo, that he looks upon *it* as no other than a *Pretence* of the Heathens to ſave themſelues from confuſion, as manifeſtly appears. 1ſt From the word *Volunt* (for we haue that *unlucky* word here too, *Ipſum*, (*ſc. Iovem*) *Deorum omnium dearumque Regem eſſe volunt*:) which as I ſaid before ſignifies what they would haue, but *S. Auguſtin* would not grant, viz, *their Iupiter* to be the *King of the Gods as well as Men*, as the Dr. reads it. Hence in the 17th *chapter* of the ſame Book, he ſaith, *Iovem Deorum Regem pro ſua Opinione confingunt*, *that they faign Iupiter in their*

own Opinion, (not his) to be the King of the Gods: and in the 25th *chapter* he shows that *themſelves believed Happineſſ not to be given by Iupiter, but by ſome God whom they did not know.* And if he proved the very *pretence* in them to be *falſe*, ſurely he was farr enough himſelf from thinking the *thing* to be *true*, viz that *their Jupiter was the true God.* 2. From the words immediately foregoing thoſe cited by the Dr. For there he derides the *Heathens*, (and it was *his way* too) for aſcribing the *greatneſſ* and *continuance* of the *Roman Empire* to *Jupiter*: *Nimirum ergo Jovis hoc opus eſt. This then, without any peradventure* ſaith he, *is the Work of Jove, for they will haue him to be the King of all the Gods and Goddeſſes*, and then 3. Having in the ſame Ironical way propoſed the Arguments, made uſe of that time by the *Heathens* to ſupport their *pretence* (and now brought in anew by the Dr. to ſupport the *ſame*) viz, *that they put a Scepter in his hand, and built his Temple upon a high hill* &c. he ſets himſelf to confute them as *abſurd* and *foolish*. And firſt he shews the Opinion of *Varro*, (who believed *Iupiter* to be the

ſame with the *God* of the *Jews*, to be contradicted by the practice of the *Romans*; *If it be ſo*, ſaith he, *why is He ſo ill treated at Rome, as to make or dedicate a Simulacre to him?* Then in the very next chapter He proves at large that which way ſoever they take *Jupiter*, either as the *Son* of *Saturn*, and the *Brother* and *Husband* of *Juno*, according to the *Poets* and *Hiſtorians*; or ſo as to underſtand by *Jupiter* the *Fire*, and by *Juno* the *Ayr* according to the *Philoſophers*, *non eſt ille de quo dictum eſt, Jovis omnia plena, It is not He of whom it is ſaid, All things are fill'd with Jove, if Juno alſo fill ſome part*, and therefore *Virgil* muſt contradict himſelf, when he ſaid not as a *Poet*, but as a Philoſopher, as *S Auguſtin* notes.

Li. 4. de civ. Dei. c. 9.

c. 10.

Tunc Pater Omnipotens fœcundis imbribus Æther
Conjugis in gremium lætæ deſcendit.

After this he proceeds for divers chapters together to refute the Several *Interpretations*, which the Learneder *Heathens* had deviſed to make their *Pretence* appear plauſible, as *that all the Gods were but one and the ſame Jupiter*; that *God is the Soul of the world*, that *thoſe whom they*

c. 11.
c. 12.
c. 24.

called Gods, were but Divine Gifts &c. And although the Dr. may sleight these arguments of *S. Augustin* also as *casts of his former employment*, (for I believe he hath heard of him that he was a *Rhetorician* before his *Conversion*, as well as T. G. of *Origen* that he was thought to be *Heretical*,) yet they evidently evince at least, that it was not *his own Sense*, that the Heathen's *Iupiter* was the true *God*. And if what I haue
p. 296. 297. said here, and before, be not sufficient to convince you of it, hear what he saith
l. 17. in the 17th *chapter* of the same *Book* where he argues against *Iupiter's being* the *Supream God* from their making *Victory* a *Goddess*. *Will they say*, saith he, *that Iupiter sends the Goddess Victoria, and she in Obedience to the King of Gods takes part with them to whom she is sent, this* saith he, *is truly said, not of that Iupiter, whom in their Opinion they faign to be the King of the Gods, but of Him who is the true King of Ages.* As for *their Iupiter* you heard before
Psal. 96. what his *Verdict* was, where he said, that *none but wicked Spirits, or Devils, were worshipped in their Temples*; not so much as King *Iupiter* himself excep-

ted. And now, pray tell me *Catharinus* if the Dr. had not great reaſon to vaunt, that he had given a *full and clear Evidence of the conſent of all the Fathers in this matter, and that not taken from any ſingle or incoherent paſſages, but from the Series and Deſign of their diſcourſes*, when he impoſes vpon us for the *Senſe* of *S. Auguſtin*, what *S. Auguſtin* propoſes as an *Obiection* of the *Heathens* and ſets himſelf to confute with all the wit and learning he had. And your ſelf as yet haue not been able, nor I am confident, ever will be able to pick out of all the Teſtimonies of the *Chriſtian Fathers* alledged by him, ſo much as a *Covie of one*, who aſſerts it as his own Senſe, *that the Heathen's Iupiter was the true God*? Def. 101.

Cath. Here you bring the matter indeed to a *Pinch*. But giue me leaue to tell you, that for all your confidence you may be, and are miſtaken. For there is *one* yet behind whoſe Authority may ſtand for many.

Eun: Who is that I pray?

Cath. No leſſe a man than *Tertullian*.

Eun: *Tertullian?* Though I believe

the Dr. *hath heard how he also hath been condemn'd for an Heretick*, as well as *Origen*; yet if you can show, that he acknowledged *Iupiter that was worshipped in the Capitol* to be the *true God*, I shall resign my *Iudgment* so farr, as *to suppose that what he said was the Common Sense of the Fathers.*

Cath. And if I do not manifestly prove it out of him from the *Testimonies* alledged by the Dr. I shall willingly, for what I am concerned in it, *yeild* up the *Cause.*

Eun: Let us then bring the matter to an *Issue*, and hear what it is, that *Tertullian* saith.

[*Def. p. 62. Tertull. Apolog. c. 17.* *Cath.* First, as Dr. St. observes, *He appeals to the Consciences of men for the clearest Evidence of one true and Supream God. For in the midst of all their Idolatries, saith he, they are apt upon any great occasion to lift up their hands and Eyes to heaven, where the Only True, and Good God is. Then he mentions their common Phrases, God gives, and God sees, and I commend you to God, and God will restore: All which do shew the Natural Testimony of Conscience as to the Vnity and Supream Excellency of*

Id. de Test. Animæ.

God. And in his Book ad Scapulam, (Pray mark it well) *God, saith he, shewed himself to be the Powerful God, by what he did upon their Supplications to him under the name of Jove.* Now although the two first passages prove no more, but that the *Heathens* had a Notion of *one Supream Being* ingrafted in their minds by nature, (which you will not allow to come home to *the Question*) Yet *this last* clearly evinces that *Jupiter*, whom they worshipped in the *Capitol*, was this *one Supream Being*, both from the Testimony of *Tertullian*, and of *God* himself, by the *Miracle* he did upon their *Supplications* (i. e. the Supplications of the *Heathens*) made to him under the name of *Jove.* *Ad Scap. c. 4.*

Eun: A Miracle! Here you have brought the matter to a brave *Issue* indeed. But did *Tertullian* then in good earnest say *that God did a Miracle to shew himself the Powerful God upon the Supplications the Heathens made to him under the name of Jove?* Dr. St. you know is not over-fond of proving doctrines by *Miracles*, and I cannot but wonder he should now make

ıſe of *one* to eſtablish a doctrine ſo *contrary* to that of the Holy *Scriptures* both *Old* and *New*. For what I read there
Pſ. 96. *Pſ. 105.* is, that *All the Gods of the Heathens are Devils*, as the Septuagint translate it, that *they ſacrificed their ſons and*
Deut. *daughters to Devils*; and again, (as if
32. 1. *Cor.* 10. it were purpoſely intended for Dr. St.) *They Sacrificed to Devils, and not to God. What the Heathens offer in Sacrifice, they offer to Devils, and not to God.* Methinks it might haue ſufficed to haue laid this Infamous *Brat* of *Jupiter's being the true God Bleſſed for evermore*, at S. *Paul's* door, and not to *father* it vpon *God* himſelf. Such *bad cuſtomes* as theſe are to be broken, leaſt they grow vp into *open Blaſphemy*; and I shall endeavour to make the *right Father* ſtand for his own *child*. But firſt are you ſure *Catharinus*, that it was vpon the *Supplications* of the *Heathens* that the Dr. avouches *Tertullian* to ſay, that *God* did this *Miracle?*

Cath. Yes for he makes this *Preface* before the Teſtimony of *Tertullian*, that he will *now look into the Senſe of Writers of the Latine Church againſt the Heathens Idolaters*; and accordingly it

is of *them* that he ſpeaks in the *two* former paſſages, and the particle *their* (viz Supplications) evidently relates to *them*. Beſides, when was it ever heard that *Chriſtians* made *their Supplications* under the name of *Jove*? *Origen*, as the Dr. notes, ſaith *that by reaſon of the abundance of filthy and obſcene Fables, which went of their Jupiter, the Chriſtians would by no means endure to haue the true God called by his name.* And S. *Paul*, as your ſelf obſerved, though he cited a place out of *Aratus*, where he had mentioned *Jupiter* twice before, yet would not himſelf make uſe of the name. Nor do I believe that Dr. St. himſelf will ever think fit to put into his *Letany*, or to conclude any of his *Works* with that Invocation of *Paterculus*, *Jupiter Capitoline*, *Auctor & Stator Romani nominis*. There is a *decorum* to be obſerved in the *uſe* and *application* of *words* by reaſon of the *change* they are ſubject to from *time* and other Circumſtances; as it would be abſurd at preſent to make uſe of the *Old Tranſlation* of thoſe words of the *Apoſtle*, Paulus Servus Jeſu Chriſti, *Paul the Knave of Jeſus Chriſt.*

Def. 9. 9. Orig. contr. Celſ. li. 4.

Eun: Very well. It was then vpon the *Supplications* of the *Heathens* to God under the name of *Jove*, that Dr. St. avouches *Tertullian* to say, that he did the *Miracle*. But what will you say, *Catharinus*, if *Tertullian* expresly affirm, that it was done vpon the *Supplications* of the *Christians* made to *God*, but that the *Heathens* after it was done, would haue ascribed it to *Jove*?

Cath. Marry then will I never *truft* Testimony of *Father* more for Dr. St's sake.

Eun: You mean I suppose *cited by him*; and you haue reason to do so from the *experience* you haue had in *other Instances*, but in none more *fully*, not more *foully* than in *this*, where he hath corrupted the words and Sense of *Tertullian*, in so *subtil*, and yet *palpable* a manner, as is not easy to be found in any other. Haue you the works of *Tertullian*?

Cath. Yes, here they are, the Place cited by the Dr. is *Lib. ad Scapulam. cap. 4*. Pray turn to it.

Eun: Lo, here it is. And the words are these. *Marcus quoque Aurelius in Germanica expeditione, Christianorum militum*

litum

situm Orationibus ad Deum factis, imbres in sitim illa impetravit. Quando non geniculationibus & Jejunationibus nostris etiam siccitates sunt depulsæ? Tunc & Populus adclamans Deo Deorum & qui solus Potens, in Iovis nomine Deo nostro testimonium reddidit, that is to say if I haue not forgot my *Grammar*, that *Marcus Aurelius in the* German *Expedition, when his Army was ready to perish for want of water, obtained rain by the Supplications of the* CHRISTIAN SOVLDIERS *made to God. And indeed* saith he *when were not such Kind of calamities removed by the Prayers and Fasting of us Christians? Then the People also with their Acclamations to the God of Gods, and who alone is Powerful, gaue Testimony to our God under the name of Iove.* These are the words; and the design of *Tertullian* if I mistake not, in this passage was to convince *Scapula*, that he ought not to persecute the *Christians*, by whose *Prayers* so *miraculous* a Benefit had been obtained of *God*; and the more, because the very *Heathens* themselves, though according to *their custome*, they made their *acclamations* to

Iove, yet under that name by the Titles they gaue him of *God of Gods*, *and alone moſt Powerful*, they gaue *Teſtimony* to the *God* of the *Chriſtians*, who had wrought the Miracle. Now what does Dr. St? He jumbles together the *Supplications* of the *Chriſtian* Souldiers, and the *Acclamations* of the *Heathens*, the *God* of the Chriſtians and *Iupiter*, and makes the Senſe to be, *that God shew'd himſelf to be the Powerful God by what he did vpon the Supplications of the Heathens to him under the name of Iove.* And can any thing be more *contradictory* to the *words* and *Senſe* of *Tertullian* than this is? *Tertullian* ſaith expreſsly that what *God* did, was vpon the *Supplications* of the *Chriſtians* made to him. Dr. St. makes him ſay, *it was vpon the Supplications of the Heathens. Tertullian* ſaith that the Heathens by the *Acclamations* they made to the *God of Gods* as they called *Iove*, gaue Teſtimony to the *God* of the *Chriſtians* under that name. Dr. St. makes him ſay, that *God* wrought the *Miracle* vpon *their Supplications* to him under the name of *Iove*.

Chriſtianorum militum Orationibus ad Deum factis.

Cath. The *Firſt* part of this is plainer

than I could *wish* it for Dr. St's. credit. For I see the words in *Tertullian* are, *Orationibus CHRISTIANORVM ad Deum factis*, by the Prayers of the *Christians* made to *God*, not of the *Heathens*. But I do not so well understand the *latter*. For when *Tertullian* saith *they gave Testimony to our God under the name of Iove*, what can his meaning be, but that they intended to *honour him* under that name, to *whom* they had before addressed their *Supplications*?

Eun: No such matter I can assure you, *Catharinus*: but what the *Heathens* meant was to rob the *God* of the *Christians* of the *honour*, and transferr it to their *Iove* by giving to him the Title of *God of Gods &c.* but in so doing, they gave *Testimony to our God* that he alone was the *most Powerful*, who had done this *Miracle* upon the Supplications of the *Christians*; This is what *Tertullian* meant to tell us not that the *Heathens*, had addressed *their Supplications* to the *true God* under the name of *Iove*. And that you may see this was his *Sense*; pray hear what he saith in the 40th chap. of his *Apologetick* against the Heathens, where he describes both the

manner of their *Supplications*, and to *whom* they made them, and reproaches them with their *bad custome* of ascribing to their *false God Iupiter*, what the *Christians* had obtained of the only *true God* by *their* Prayers *When there is fear*, saith he, *of a bad year through too much drouth*, *you* (speaking to the Priests of the Heathens) *wallowing in luxe and wantonnesse*, *offer sacrifices for rain to Iupiter*, *command the People to go barefoot*, *and seeking Heaven in the Capitol*, *expect the Clouds to shower down from the Roof*, *averse in so doing both from God and Heaven*. *But we* (Christians) *in the mean time depriving our selves of all sustenance*, *and even dry'd up with fasting*, *and rowling our selves in Sack-cloth and Ashes*, *strike Heaven with Envy*, *and move God himself with compassion*. Et cum misericordiam extorserimus, Jupiter honoratur. *And when we haue by these means extorted mercy*, *Iupiter must haue the honour*. Where you see he evidently distinguishes the *God* of the *Christians* from *their Iove* to whom they intended the *honour*. And that it was so in this very passage we are vpon, is acknowledged by Dr. St. himself,

Def. p. 47.

when ſpeaking of it in another place, he ſaith, that by thoſe words of *Tertullian*, [*Then the whole Army made this Exclamation, Deo Deorum*] *it is evident*, ſaith he, *they intended this honour to their own Iove*: And now I hope *Catharinus*, you are ſatisfied of the *Senſe* of *Tertullian*, that he makes both the *Acclamations*, and *Supplications* of the *Heathens* to haue been directed not to the *true God* under the name of *Iove*, but to that *Deity* whom they believed to reſide in the *Capitol*, as diſtinct from him. But what will the Dr. do to ſave himſelf from the ſhame of ſo notorious a *Falſification* of the *words* and *Senſe* of *Tertullian*, as to make him aſcribe that to the *Supplications* of the *Heathens* made to *Iove*, which Tertullian expreſsly ſaith was obtained by the Supplications of the *Chriſtians* made to God?

Cath. I doubt not, but he will find a *clew* to bring himſelf out of this *Labyrinth*, though I confeſs I am *loſt* in it my ſelf.

Eun: Will he cite *Iulius Capitolinus* and *Dio*? The former of which attributes the miracle to the *Prayers* of *M.*

Aurelius himself; the latter to a particular *Providence* of *God*, yet mentioning withall a report that it was done by the *Magical* Operation of one *Arnuphis*. These indeed are two of *his Fathers*, but will not serve his turn, so well as *Father Bellarmin*, and *Father Coccius* do T. G's. For *Eusebius* tells us, that this *miraculous Event* was delivered to Posterity, both by the *Heathen* and *Christian* Writers, but with this difference, *that the Heathens as being averse from Faith, relate it in such a manner, as it doth not evidently appear, that it was obtained by the Prayers of the Christians; But the Christian Writers, as being Lovers of Truth recount the matter plainly, but truly as it was done*; viz upon the Supplications of the *Christian* Souldiers, and then cites *Apollinarius* and *Tertullian* for it. So that if the *Christian Fathers* may be credited rather than the *Heathen*, this miraculous deliverance was obtained by the *Prayers* of the *Christians*.

Hist. Eccl. li. 5. c. 5.

But now, (as I remember he saith of T. G. (*I have reason to consider the temper of the Person I have to deal with,*

Def. p. 6.

Who knows but the Teſtimony of one *Heathen Father*, (eſpecially ſuch a one as he deſcribes *M. Aurelius* to be) may weigh more with him, than the Teſtimonies of *twenty Chriſtian*, whom he can ſend to ſchool again, when he pleaſes, to learn to *explain* themſelves better, as he doth the *Chriſtian Cicero* Lactantius p. 43. Let us then hear how *M. Aurelius* himſelf *relates* the matter in his *Letters* to the *Senate*. And thus it was, that being in great diſtreſſ for want of *water*, he ſent for thoſe who are called *Chriſtians* in his Army, and intreated their help. And when they had caſt themſelves vpon the earth, they not only prayed for me, ſaith he, but alſo for the whole Army, that ſome Redreſſ might be given to the Hunger and Thirſt, with which we were preſſed, for it was *five days*, that we had not taken ſo much as a litle *water*, becauſe none was to be had, we being then in the midſt of *Germany* ſhut in with *Mountains* on every ſide. But as ſoon as *they* had caſt themſelves vpon the earth, and made their Supplications to *that God*, whom I was ignorant of (*it ſeems then it was not*

p. 11. 31. 32.

» *Iove*,) presently there fell vpon us
» from heaven a very cool and refreshing
» *shower*, but vpon our Enemies *Hail* in
» the likeness of *Fire*, and *Flashes* of
» *Lightning*. And *that God* who cannot
» be resisted nor overcome presently heard
» *their Prayers* and *Supplications*. Where-
» fore, saith he, let us from hence-
» forward permit them to be *Christians*,
» least by *their Prayers* they obtain like
» Arms against us. And then commands
Vid. Euseb li. 5. c. 20. apud Baron. An. 176. & Rescriptum l. apud Pamel. in Tertull. Apol. c. 5. » that no man presume to *inform* against
» them vpon the account of their being
» *Christians*, under the penalty of being
» burnt alive. This is what *M. Aurelius*
himself related to the *Senate*. And what
will the Dr. say to the Testimony of so
Eminent a *Father*? Will he *criticize* as
his custome is in like cases, vpon the
Mountains, and the *five days* want of
water, and the *Hail* in the likeness of
Fire, to make the *story* seem *Improbable*,
and the *letters* to haue been forged by
the *Christians*? That will not do his
work; for *Dio* another of his *Fathers*
confesses that *M. Aurelius* did write
of this miraculous deliverance to the *Se-
nate*, though he omit to set down the
words of the letter, out of the like good
will,

will, we may ſuppoſe, to the *Chriſtians*, as he had before omitted to declare that it was obtained by *their Prayers*, although he went not ſo farr (as the Dr. does) as to affirm it was done vpon the *Supplications* of the *Heathens*. But *Tertullian* in his *Apologetick* againſt the *Heathens* affirms expreſsly, *that the Letters of M. Aurelius were extant in his time, in which he aſcribes his deliverance to the Prayers of the Chriſtians, who, as it happened, ſerved in that Expedition.* And in this he is approved by *Euſebius* in his *Chronicon*. Now I appeal to your ſelf, *Catharinus*, if you can imagin, that ſo grave a man as *Tertullian*, who evermore made the *Sincerity* of the *Chriſtians* one main Article of his *Apology*, would tell a lye in ſo notorious a matter of Fact, and of which there were ſome yet alive who might convince him; or inſolently dare, vpon an uncertain report of letters written by *M. Aurelius* attribute *that Victory* to the *Prayers* of the *Chriſtians*, which had been obtained by *his* own *prayers*, were it true what Father *Julius Capitolinus* relates, or vpon the *Supplications* of the *Heathens*, as Dr. St. will haue it. Cap. 5.

Baron. ad An. 176. This is the Summe of what *Baronius* hath deliuered at large concerning this matter, with so great Euidence, that which way soeuer the Dr. turn himself, he must needs find himself like *M. Aurelius*, shut in with *Mountains*, and stand in need of the *Prayers* of good *Christians* to *God* to help him out; vnless he think the *Supplications* of the *Heathens* to *Iove*, may be as available for him, as he makes them to haue been for *Aurelius*. And indeed whoeuer considers, how prodigal he is both of his pains and credit to *Apologize* for them, must needs see the great obligation they haue to giue him the *Assistance* of *their Prayers*.

But I haue not yet done with the Dr. vpon this Point. *Scapula* to whom *Tertullian* wrote that Book was President of *Carthage*, a man that threatned vtter destruction to the *Christians*, vnless they would renounce *Christ*, and offer *Sacrifice* to the *Gods*. To appease his fury *Tertullian* writes this Book, wherein he first expoſes the *Innocent life* of the *Christians*, and then the *Punishments*, which had fallen vpon many of those, who had *persecuted* them,

Li. ad Scap.

and the great *Bleſſings* and *Benefits*, which others had received, who had treated them with *clemency*, and amongſt the reſt the *miraculous Victory* given to *M. Aurelius* in the *German* expedition, the paſſage cited by Dr. St. This being the *Scope* of *Tertullian* in that Book, I would gladly know if any man of Common Senſe can conceive him to haue been ſo *Senſleſſ*, as to think to perſwade *Scapula* not to compell the *Chriſtians* againſt their Conſcience to burn *Incenſe* to *Jove*, by telling him *that God had ſhown himſelf to be the Powerfull God by what he did* in the aforeſaid Expedition *upon the Supplications of the Heathens to him under the name of Jove*. This ſurely had been the ready way not to *allay*, but to *enflame* the Fury of the Perſecuter, to ſee a People ſo obſtinate that whereas they acknowledged the *miraculous* effect of Prayers made to *God* under the name of *Jove* they would not burn *Incenſe* nor *ſacrifice* to him under the ſame name. Nor can I ſee how the *Primitive Chriſtians* were *excuſable* in their ſufferings, any otherwiſe than as *Weak Brethren* who wanted good information, when as *Origen* ſaith, *they*

were ready to undergo any torments rather than to confeſs Jupiter to be God. Was this then an *Apology* for ſo *Wiſe* a man as *Tertullian* to make? No; But it is ſuch an One, as Dr St. it ſeems would haue thought fit to make had he been in *thoſe* Circumſtances. Otherwiſe he would never haue taken ſo much pains to fix it vpon *Tertullian*, though he could not do it but by *corrupting* his *words* as you haue ſeen, and affirming what He ſaith was done by the *Prayers* of the *Chriſtians* to God, to haue been done vpon the *Supplications* of the *Heathens to him under the name of Jove.* So foul a Paſſage as this was never fetch'd from the Store-houſes of *Father Bellarmin*, or *Father Coccius*, but of a much more *Primitive Father*, than either of them; of whom the Prophet *Eſay* cites a ſaying [*I will be like to the moſt High*] which afterwards ſerv'd for an *Original* for the *Poets* and *Orators* to write by, when they gaue to *Jupiter* the Title of *Pater Omnipotens & Supremus.*

Cath. Hold there, Good *Eunomius.* You know very well *Humanum eſt labi.* Every *ſlip* is not a *kick* with the

Cloven-foot. The wiſeſt man may be over-ſeen in the Senſe of an Author; through *haſt* or *inadvertence*, or *heat* of diſputation: And this is the *utmoſt* which I think you ought or can impute to Dr. St. in this caſe.

Eun: In this I confeſs you ſpeak like a *Good Chriſtian.* And I ſhould be ready to cloſe with you in the ſame Judgment, were I not well aſſured, that Dr. St. *knew* the contrary of what he affirmed, to be the *Truth.* What if I ſhew you *his own words* ſome pages before in which he affirms expreſsly, that what was done at that time, was obtained by the *Prayers* of the *Chriſtians* to God, and that the *Heathens* intended to rob *him* of the *honour*, and give it to *their* own *Jove*, and that this was the *Senſe* of *Tertullian* in the very place cited now by him in favour of the *Heathens*?

Cath. This will ſeem to me as ſtrange, as the *Hail* which fell in the likeneſs of *Fire.*

Eun: Pray take *his* Book; It lies there before you, and read what he ſaith of this matter. Pag. 47. —— Pray read it out.

Dr. St's. Def. p. 47.

Cath. When the miraculous *Victory* was obtained by *M. Antoninus* over the *Marcomanni* by the Prayers of the *Christians*, (as *Tertullian* and *Apollinaris* say upon good grounds, although the *Heathen Historians* attribute it to the vertue of *Antoninus*, or to some *Magicians* with him) the whole Army made this Exclamation, saith *Tertullian*, *Deo Deorum & qui solus Potens*; whereby they did saith he, *in Jovis nomine Deo nostro Testimoninm reddere*: by which it is evident they intended this honour to their own *Jove*; for in the whole Army only the *Legio Fulminatrix* are supposed to haue been *Christians*; And besides this upon *Antoninus* his Co'umn at *Rome*, *Baronius* tells us there is still to be seen the *Effigies* of *Iupiter Pluvius*, destroying men and horses w.th *Thunder* and *Lightning*.

Ii. ad Scap. c. 4.

Eun: Behold here a very fair *Confession*, and *Conviction* too from Dr. St's. own mouth. For 1st it is here confessed by him, that the *Victory* was *miraculous*. 2ly That it was obtained by the *Prayers* of the *Christians* made to *God*. 3. That *this* is so affirmed by *Tertullian* in the very place alledged by him.

4. That he acknowledges it was so affirmed by him upon *good grounds*, which were chiefly the *letters* of M. *Aurelius* to the *Senate*. 5. That he judged the *Grounds* vpon which he spake to be *Good*, notwithstanding that the *Heathen Historians* attributed it to the vertue of *Antoninus*, or to some *Magicians* with him, as you heard before out of *Julius Capitolinus* and *Dio*. 6. That the whole Army by their Exclamation *Deo Deorum & qui solus Potens*, intended to give the honour to *their own Jove*; and confirms it farther himself from the *Effigies* of *Jupiter Pluvius* still to be seen vpon *Antoninus* his Column at *Rome*. And now after so clear a *Confession* of all these things, what could move so subtil a *wit* as Dr. St. to make *Tertullian* say, *that God shewed himself to be the Powerful God by what he did vpon the Supplications of the Heathens to him under the name of Jove*? Had he *first* said *this*, and *afterwards* told us, that the *Victory* was obtained by the *Prayers* of the *Christians*, as he confesseth *Tertullian* saith vpon good grounds it was, I might haue thought he had *corrected* himself vpon a *Second* Consideration of

the *Grounds*, vpon which *Tertullian* saith it. But having *first* acknowledged *them* to be *good*, (notwithstanding the Pretensions of the *Heathen Historians*) after this I say in spight of *those grounds*, to make *Tertullian* say, that *God* gave the *Victory* vpon the *Supplications* of the *Heathens* to him under the name of *Iove*, is an argument to me not so much that Dr. St. *was grown very sleepy when he wrote this, or that he wrote it in a dreã*, (as he saith of T. G.) as that he wilfully *shut* his eyes, when he was broad *awake*. And therefore I hope, *Catharinus*, you will not forget. 1st What you *stipulated* with me, when we entred vpon the Examination of *this Place*, viz, never more to trust *Testimony* of *Father* cited by Dr. St. For were not the *Instances* so many, and so pregnant, as hath been shewed, of his *foul Play* in this Kind; yet *this* alone is so *notorious*, that it may suffice in the Judgment of all Impartial men to implead him guilty of having *forfeited* all *Right* of ever hereafter being believed in any *Testimonies* he alledges. 2dly That vpon the *whole* you will confess, that after all his vapouring of *the full Account he would give us of the Sense*

Def. p. 720.

of the Fathers in this Point, and after the *brave Covie of Partridges* he tells us he had found, he hath not produced so much as a poor *Covie of one Christian Father*, who asserts it to be *his Sense*, that the *Heathen's Jupiter* (or as he calls him, *their own Jove*) *was the true God*; but all the *Testimonies* he brings out of them are either *impertinent* to the Question, or their design *mis-represented*, or the very *Text* it self *corrupted*, as hath been shewed. And so with your leave I bid you once more *Farewel*.

Cath. For the present I am content. But I cannot let you go *so* for good and all. You must promise to let me see you *again*.

Eun: And *again* if you please. Now I haue pass'd my time, a *day* or *two* or *three* more or less will break no squares. I will attend you.

THE FOVRTH DIALOGVE.

THE ARGUMENT.

CAtharinus *waves the Question of* Jupiter's *being the* true God: *and inforces the Parallel from the* Heathen's *acknowledgment of* one Supream Being, *to which Dr. St. contends, that they referred the worship of their Inferiour Deities. Another notable Instance of his* unfaithful reporting *a passage of* Thomas Aquinas; *and the* Generality *of the Heathens shown by most evident Arguments to haue believed and worshipped a multitude of* Gods *properly so called and esteemed by them. What kind of* Notion *the* Vulgar Heathens *had of the* Divinity, *explained, and the* Parallel *between* their *worship, and that of the* Church *of* Rome *shown to be* unjust, *and rejected as such by Eminent Divines of the* Church *of* England.

CATHARINVS. EVNOMIVS.

Evn.: I perceive by the deſire you expreſs'd of ſeeing me again, there is ſomething ſtill behind, which you haue a mind to propoſe. I ſhall be willing to hear it, but hope you will not trouble your ſelf or me any more with the Dr's *Fathers*; I dare aſſure you, it will not be at all for his *Credit*.

Cathar. T'is a *Tranſport* which *Great Wits* are too often ſubject to out of a deſire of Glory, to advance a *Paradox*, and endeavour to make it *plauſible* by Artifices of *Rhetorick* and gain credit to it by *unexpected* Explications of *Ancient* Authors, eſpecially when they haue a fair Occaſion of catching an Adverſary *nodding*, if not *faſt aſleep*. as Dr. St. preſum'd he had done T. G. when he aſſerted the *Heathen's* Supream God *Iupiter*, to be according to the *Fathers* an *Arch-devil*, and produced none for it but *Father Origen*.

Eun: *Wits* then you ſee as well as *Souldiers* muſt haue care how they go a catching of *Tartars*, as I think Dr. St.

hath done, whilst he endeavoured to ſet *Iupiter* in the Throne of *God*. But what is it, that you haue to propoſe?

Cathar. Perhaps I may be miſtaken in the Conjecture I haue made; but whatever it were that engaged the Dr. in that *Controverſy*, I do not ſee but he might haue *wav'd* it without any prejudice to his *main Argument* againſt T. G. For whether the *Heathen's Iupiter* were the *Supream God* or no, it is certain from the Teſtimonies of the *Fathers*, that the *Heathens* acknowledged a *Supream Being*, Maker and Governour of the world. And if they worshipped their *Inferiour deities*, but as his *Miniſters*, and their *Images*, but as *Symbols* or Repreſentations of *Him* and *Them*, and yet were charged by the *Fathers* with *Idolatry* for ſo doing, t is evident that T. G. will never be able to *excuſe* himſelf, and thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome* from *Idolatry*, by pretending they referr the worship they giue to *Saints* and *Images* to *God*, but He muſt vpon the ſame Principle excuſe the *Heathens* alſo. This I take to be the Summe and Force of the Dr's diſcourſe, and I think it will prove a *Tartar* to T. G.

Eum: A *Tartarian* Argument indeed, or ſuch an one as a *Tartar*, were he as ſubtil a *Diſputant* as Dr. St. would bring to defend himſelf from becoming a *Chriſtian*. But where the force of it lies I cannot ſee. For if we conſider the *Whole*, it can be no Juſt Ground to charge either the *Heathens* in that Suppoſition, or the *Romaniſts*, with Idolatry, till it be proved to be *Idolatry* to give an *Inferiour* degree of *Worſhip* or *Veneration* to any thing for the *relation* it hath to the only *true God*. Here it was, he ſhould haue laid the *Axe* to the *root*, but it was impoſſible for him to make it enter, either in reſpect of the *Heathens* in the aforeſaid Suppoſition, or of thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome*.

1. Not in reſpect of the *Heathens*. For from whence ſhould he ſhow it? Not from the *light* of *nature*; for that teaches us, that although no *Irrational* and *Inanimate Beings* be capable of that *real Excellency*, as to deſerve *any honour* from us for it's own ſake, much leſſ *divine*, yet even ſuch things may haue a *Relation* to matters of ſo high a nature, as to deſerve a *different uſage* an l regard from other things, yea a *Re-*

verence, and if I may ſo call it, with the Dr. *a Religious Reſpect*. Not from the *Law* of *Moſes*, at leaſt for all *thoſe Heathens* who lived before it was given, and conſequently could not be judged by it. Nor yet for the *reſt*, becauſe the *Apoſtle* declares them alſo *not* to be *under the Law*, any farther than the *light* of *Nature* manifeſted to them, that what they did was *Good* or *Evil* in its ſelf. Of which kind the Dr. ſuppoſeth the knowledge of *Idolatry* as to the *Heathens* to be none, when he ſaith, *From whence ſhould they know the ſinfulneſs of it, but from the Law of God?*

2. Nor in reſpect of thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome*. 1. Becauſe the *Law* of *Moſes* no where forbids to give an *Inferiour* degree of *Reverence* and *reſpect* to other things for the *Relation* they bear to *God*. 2. Becauſe in caſe it had, the *Law* is evinced in that part to be a *Poſitive Precept* only, by *God*'s diſpenſing with the *Jews* to give it to the *Ark*, with relation to him; and ſo not to oblige *Chriſtians*. 3. Becauſe thoſe of the *Church* of *England*, and all others who give an *Inferiour reſpect* and *Veneration* to *Sacred Things* and *Places* for the *relation* they

haue to God, muſt be *Idolaters* on the ſame account, and therefore *Eminent divines* (as I show'd before) of the *Church* of *England* free the *Church* of *Rome* from *Idolatry* in that reſpect. This then was firſt to haue been done by the Dr. to make thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome* *Idolaters* by paralleling them with the *Heathens* in the aforeſaid Suppoſition viz, he ought to haue shown it to be *Idolatry* in the nature of the thing independently of any *Poſitive* Prohibiton, (in caſe there were any ſuch, which is denied) to give an *Inferiour* degree of *reſpect* or *Veneration* to other things beſides *God* for the *relation* they haue to him But this he neither hath done, nor ever will be able to do, and conſequently this *mighty* *Argument*, which the Dr. ſpent ſo much time and pains to build vp and adorn with the choiceſt *Painting* and *Sculpture* his *Wit* and *Art* could deviſe, falls to the Ground for want of a *Foundation* to bear it up.

Part. 1. p. 33. 34.

Cathar. Yet ſtill me thinks the *Argument* holds good againſt T. G. unleſſ he will ſet as litle by the *Fathers*, as you make Dr. St. to do. For if they acknowledged *one Supream Being*, and referred

all their worship both of Inferiour *deities* and *Images* to him, and were notwithstanding charged by the *Fathers* with *Idolatry* for so doing, those of the *Church* of *Rome* must fall under the same charge.

Eun: To this I thought I had given you a sufficient Answer in the Account I gave you of the *Heathen's Theology*, and the *Arguments* made use of by the *Fathers* to impugn it; from all which it appears, that it was not their design to charge them with *Idolatry* for giving an *inferiour* degree of *worship* to things relating to God, but *for worshipping the Creatures, not the Creator*, (mark that, though they could not but have a *natural* and inbred *knowledge* of him) *with that worship which is due only to the One true God*, as *S. Augustin* expresly layes the charge. But because I see you are not yet fully satisfied in this Point (so hard it is to shake off a *prejudicate Opinion*) I shall desire you as you are a Lover of Truth to answer me ingenuously but to this one Question, which I take to be *very material toward the true Understanding the nature of Idolatry*, viz. Whether you do not think, that the

Part. 3. p. 330. &c

Li. 6. de Civ. Dei c. 1.

Heathens,

Heathens, at least the *Generality* of them (Those I mean who followed the *Religion* of the *State*, and squared both their *belief* and *worship* according to the *Rules* of it, for of the *Wiser* one we may have occasion to speak afterwards) did not acknowledge and worship more *Gods* than *One*?

Cuthar. To this I shall give you a very *clear* and *direct Answer*, in the words of *One*, against whom T. G. himself will not except. I mean *Thomas Aquinas*, in the Book he purposely wrote against the *Gentiles*, *li.* 1. *c.* 4. Where as Dr. St. hath well observ'd he confesses, *that most of the Gentiles did acknowledge One Supream God, from whom they said all those others whom they called Gods did receive their being; and that they ascribed the name of divinity to all Immortal substances, chiefly by reason of their Wisdome, Happiness and Government. Which custome of speaking, saith he, is likewise found in Scripture, where either the Holy Angels or men, and Judges are called Gods, I have said, yee are Gods, and many other places.* By which you see, that if those of the *Church* of *Rome* will give any credit to their own great Dr. Def. p. 11.

Def. p. 18. *Aquinas*, in his Book *so highly applauded by Possevin and others for the best account of the Christian Religion in opposition to Heathenism*, they must confess also that although the *Heathens* gave the name of *Gods*, to *others* besides the *Supream God*, yet they did not believe them to be *properly* Gods, but *Analogically* only and by participation.

Eun: What I expected, *Catharinus*, was your *own Judgment* in the case, and not of *Thomas Aquinas*; and I was in hope you would have troubled us no more with the Dr's citations. But by what I now experience in you, I see I had done well to have kept you in the good humour you were in of laying *wagers*, though you had staked but a *Guiney* at a time.

Cathar. I suppose you would have gotten but litle by the *bargain* at present, had you done so. For the Book is so frequent among all those of the *Church* of *Rome* who pretend to learning, that I cannot believe the Dr. would hazard his credit so apparently, as either to *corrupt* the *Text*, or cite the passage in such a manner, as to *mis-represent* the design of the Author.

Eun: This is indeed what ought to haue *weighed* with him. But haue you seen the Place your self? for you promised me from the former discoveries I had made of his *Insincerity*, in this kind, never to *trust* Testimony more cited by Dr. St.

Cathar. I confesse I haue not.

Eun: Give me leaue then to tell you what it was, that *Aquinas* was treating of in that place, and your self shall be *Iudge*, whether the Dr. haue dealt *fairly* by him or his Readers in *representing* him in the manner he doth. The *Title* of the Chapter cited by the Dr. is, *Quod Deus sit unus, that there is but One God.* This *Aquinas* proues by many Excellent reasons, to which he shows the Testimonies of *H. Scripture* to be agreable. And among other reasons he gives this for one; because *if there be two Gods, the name of God must be attributed to both, either Æquivocally, or Vnivocally. If equivocally*, saith he, *it is beside the present Intention* (mark that) *for nothing hinders, but that any thing may be called equivocally by any name, if the use and custome of the Speakers admit it. But if it be said of both Vni-*

Tho: Aquin. li. 1. cont. Gent. c. 42.

vocally, the reason for which it is said, must be the same in both; which he shows there to be *Impossible*. Having thus declared his *Intention* to be to prove that *there is but one God* properly so called, and established it by the plainest *demonstrations*, as a most certain Truth; the *Corollary* he inferrs from these Premisses is, that *by vertue of this Truth the Gentiles who acknowledged a multitude of Gods, were convinced to be in an Error, although*, saith he, (and then follow the words cited by the Dr) *plures eorum, many of them did acknowledge one Supream God, from whom they said all those Others, whom they called Gods, did receive their being; ascribing the name of Divinity to all Immortal Substances, and that chiefly by reason of their Wisdome, Happiness, and Government, which custome of speaking*, he saith, *is likewise found in Scripture.*

Hac veritate repelluntur Gentiles Deorum multitudinem confitentes: quâvis plures eorum unum Deum Summum esse dicerent, a quo omnes alios, quos Deos nuncupabant, creatos esse asserebant, omnibus substantiis Sempiternis Divinitatis nomen ascribentes &c. Quæ quidem consuetudo loquendi etiam in S. Scriptura invenitur, dum Sancti Angeli, aut etiam homines vel Judices Dij nominantur.

This is the Summe of *Aquinas* his discourse in that Chapter: And what can be more plain, than that his *meaning* was to tell us, that although the *Phi-*

losophers, particularly the *Platonicks* (whom he means by his *quamvis plures eorum*) did aknowledge *one Supream God*, from whom they said all those others, whom they called *Gods*, did receive their being, and therein agreed with the like *custome* of speaking found in *Scripture*; yet the *Generality* of the *Heathens* did acknowledge a multitude of *Gods properly* so called: and consequently that this was the *Errour* which he had convinced them of, by showing that it is *impossible* there should be more than *One God* properly so called. This I say is plain both from the declaration he makes, that to speak of Gods *equivocally* so called was *beside his purpose*, and from his opposing the Opinion of the *Philosophers* to that of the *Generality* of the Heathens, as an *Exception* from the *General* Opinion they had of them. And now I pray *Catharinus* be Judge your self whether it were *fairly* done of the Dr. to *suppress* the General Proposition, viz, [*The Heathens erred in acknowledging a multitude of Gods*] and the word Quamvis, *although*, which made the *Exception*, and then translate the words *Plures eorum*, by *the most of*

the Gentiles, as if *Aquinas* had spoken of the *Generality* of them, when he spake only of the *Philosophers*, who though they were *many*, or if you will, *a great many*, which is the *most* can be made of the word *Plures* in that place, yet they were farr from being *the most of the Gentiles*, as Dr. St. according to his excellent *faculty* in translating renders it. Is it not plain that here he *misrepresents*, to say no more, the *meaning* and *design* of *Aquinas*? And yet vpon such *perverted Testimonies* as these it is, that he builds his *Chimerical* Assertion, that the *Generality* of the *Heathens* were charged with *Idolatry* by the *Fathers* for giving an *Inferiour* degree of *worship* and *Veneration* to others besides the one only *true God*, for the *relation* they bare to him; when it is evident from the *very Testimony* he cites, that they were charged with *Idolatry* for acknowledging and worshipping *more Gods* than *One*, *properly* so called. I could here give you as good an account of the Admirable work he makes for 15 Pages together with the Testimony of *Athenagoras*, from whose discourse he pretends chiefly to inferr the *Heathen's Re-*

lative worship, as 1. how he *omits* some of the expressions of that Author which evidently *show* that they did not *refer* their worship to the *true God*. 2. How he employs all the litle arts of *Sophistry* and *Rhetorick* to debauch his Sense in *others*; and lastly how after all finding the whole *Series* and *Design* of that Father point blank *opposit* to what he would haue it, he formes the very *Assertions* of *Athenagoras* into *Objections* under the name of T. G. and sets himself to confute him as a down right *Adversary*: But as I said before I hope we haue done with the Dr's *Testimonies*; and you will tell me now what you think your self of the Question, Whether the *Heathens* did *believe* and *worship* more *Gods* properly so esteemed by them, or not?

Deo prætermisso, Elementorum mutationes deificant; perinde ac si Navigium aliquis quo vectus sit, gubernatoris loco haberet. Athenag. p. 61. 68. Def. p. 69. 62.

Cathar. I see it is troublesome for an Author to fall into the hands of *such Readers*, as haue both *Curiosity* and *Patience* to examine his *Citations*, and thereforeshall trouble you no more vpon that account. But for the *Question* you propose; I had rather hear what you will say of it, than produce my own *thoughts*, which I confess are somewhat

perplexed by what you haue already diſcourſed.

Eun: Well then, ſince you put me to *anſwer* my own *Queſtion*, I ſhall not trouble you with long diſcourſes, but only offer to your conſideration theſe few following *Obſervations*, which I hope will be ſufficient to ſatisfy you, that the *Generality* of the *Heathens* did believe them whom they publickly worſhipped to be *truly* and *properly Gods*, and not in *name* only.

The Firſt is, that the whole *Chriſtian* world till Dr. St. did ever condemn the *Heathens* as guilty of *Polytheiſm*; which they could not juſtly haue done, had the *Heathens* believed *one* only true *God*, and the *reſt* to be only *called* ſo: For vpon the ſame account both the *Iews* and *Chriſtians* might be accuſed of *Polytheiſm* for giving the name of *Gods* to *Angels* and *Men*; yea even *God* himſelf, for it was he that ſaid, I *haue ſaid ye are Gods*.

Athenagoras legat. pro Chriſt. p. 93.

2. That the *Heathens* accuſed the *Chriſtians* of *Atheiſm*, becauſe they denied *them* to be *Gods* who were publickly worſhipped.

3. That they perſecuted the *Chriſtians* to

to death, and the *Christians* willingly suffered death, for maintaining there was but *one* only *true God*, who deserved *Divine Honour* to be given to him.

4. That they erected *Temples*, instituted *Priests*, and appointed *Sacrifices* to be offered to *them*, which if not by the *Law* of *nature*, yet by the *common consent* of *mankind* were the *External Signs* of the acknowledgment of *true divinity*; and thereupon is so often urged by the *Fathers* against them, as who affirmed them to deserve *those honours*.

5. That the *Fathers* bring infinite *arguments* to prove that *those* whom the *Heathens* called *Gods*, were not *really* and *truly Gods*, which had been a *superfluous labour*, if the *Heathens* had not *believed*, as well as *called* them *Gods*.

6. That those who made use of these arguments against them, had many of them been *Heathens* themselves, as *Tertullian*, *S. Cyprian*, *Lactantius*, *and Arnobius*, who without doubt understood very well what themselves were *taught* and had *practised* while they

were *Heathens*, and cannot in reason be supposed to haue charged them with *more* in this matter than they were *guilty* of, only that they might haue occasion to give some *casts of their former employment*.

De civ. Dei. li. 3. c. 22. & li. 10. c. 1.

7. That the *Divels*, as *S. Augustin* saith, by prodigious but fallacious *signs* and predictions, perswaded *maxima parti*, which I think may be truly translated, *the most of the Heathens*, that they were *Gods*, and although the *Platonists* knew them, not to be so, from their vitious practices, yet they durst not pronounce them neither, to be altogether unworthy of *divine honour*, *for fear* saith *S. Augustin*, *of offending the People by whom they saw them served with so many Rites and Temples*.

8. That the *Wisest* of the *Heathens*, as *Varro*, *Scævola*, *Seneca* and *Cicero*, not only concurred with the *Vulgar* in the *external* practice of worshipping *many Gods*, (as the *Platonicks* also did) but look'd upon it as a Point of *prudence* or *State-Policy*, to keep the People in *Ignorance*, and not let them know, they were *no Gods* whom they worshipped. The first part is evident from what *S.*

S. Aug. ibid. li. 8. 6, 11.

Auguſtin ſaith of *Varro*, that *knowing the Vanity and falſity of the Gods who were publickly worſhipped, yet for fear of offending the people he worſhipped them himſelf, and maintained that they ought to be worſhipped*; and therefore reproaches him for ſuffering himſelf to be *overborn with the cuſtome and Laws of the City*; as he doth *Seneca* alſo for that ſaying of his, *Omnem iſtam ignobilem Deorum turbam, All this ignoble multitude of Gods, which long Superſtition hath for a long time heaped together, we will ſo worſhip, as remembring the worſhip of them to belong more to cuſtome, than Truth.* And whereas *Philoſophy* had in a manner ſet him at liberty to deride the *Errours* of the *Vulgar*, yet becauſe he was an *Illuſtrious Senator* of the *Roman People*, over-awed by the *Laws* of the *City* and the *cuſtomes* of *men*, *he worſhipped what he reprehended*; *practic'd, what he reproved, and adored, what he blamed, and this, not as Actor upon the Theatre*, but as a *devote* in the *Temple, ſo much more culpably*, ſaith *S. Auguſtin, for that he performed, thoſe actions againſt the inward Senſe of his mind, in ſuch a manner that he Peo-*

Li. 6. c. 10.

Li. 6. c. 10.

Li. 4. c. 27. *ple judged him to doe them with a real intention.* The 2d part also is no less manifest from what the same *S. Augustin* saith of *Scævola*, that he affirmed *some things would be hurtful for the people to be informed of*, as that *Hercules*; *Æsculapius &c. were not Gods*; and of Varro, *that it was expedient the People should be deceived in Religion.* And vpon this account it is, that *Lactantius* declaimes in this wise against *Cicero*, *To what purpose is it*, saith he, *to preach in this sort to the Vulgar, and Illiterate People, when we see Learned and Wise men, who understood the Vanity of these Religions, to persist nevertheless, by I know not what perverseness, in worshipping the very things they condemn? Cicero understood these things to be false which men adored, and yet after he had advanced many things, which were of force to overthrow the Common Religions, he saith that those things were not to be discoursed to the Vulgar, least such kind of disputations should extinguish the publick received Religions*, or worship of many Gods. Nothing then I think can be more plain, than that the *Generalsty* of the *Heathens* did not only give the *name* of *Gods*, ac-

Li. 2. c. 3. n. 3.

cording to the cuſtome found in H. *Scripture*, but did *really* and *truly* believe them to be *Gods*, whom they worshipped, and that it was the *State-Religion* of that time to believe and worship them as ſuch. Yet leaſt any doubt should yet remain in you from the *confuſion*, which the Dr every where makes between the *Vulgar* and the *Wiſer Heathens*, I shall adde one *Obſervation* more, which I am ſure ought and will weigh more with you than all the reſt. And it is this.

9. That *God* himſelf forbids the *Jews to haue any other Gods beſides him*, and yet was ſo farr from forbidding the *name* of *Gods* to be given to *Angels* and *Men*, that himſelf by the mouth of *David* pronounceth of the Rulers, *I haue ſaid, yee are Gods*, and accordingly *Moſes* forbids *to revile the Gods, or curſe the Ruler of the People*. By which it appears that the *meaning* of the *Commandment* was not to forbid them to give the *name* of *Gods* to others beſides himſelf, but to eſteem them to be *truly* and *properly Gods*, as the *Heathens* did. *Pſ. 81. Exod. 22. 28.*

Cathar. Theſe *Obſervations* I confeſſ are ſo clear and home, that I think

what you *inferr* from them cannot be *denied* or doubted by any man of Common Sense. And so I freely grant that the *Vulgar Heathens* did *truly* and *really* esteem *them* to be *Gods*, whom they worshipped. But I see not yet the reason, why you were so earnest with me to speak to this *Question*.

3. Hieron in Dan. 2. Error. Gentilium omnes quod supra se est, Deos putant. S. Aug. li. 1. de Conf. Evang. c. 27. Majores & Minores Deos colunt quos Deos putant.

Enn: Pardon me there, Good *Catharinus*; What was it made you so *backward* to speak to it, but that you saw, that to answer *this Question* would be to answer the *Argument* you proposed, in which you supposed the *Heathens* to referr all their worship, both of their *Inferiour Deities* and *Images* to the *true God*, and upon that account to have been charged by the *Fathers* with *Idolatry*, that so you might make the *Parallel* compleat between the worship of the *Heathens*, and that of the *Church* of *Rome*? For if the *Generality* of the *Heathens* did *truly* and *properly* esteem *those* to be *Gods*, whom they worshipped, as hath been shewed, tis evident that they did *not* referr the worship they gave to *them* to the *true God*, but worshipped *each* of them as an *absolute Deity*. And this being the Fundamental *Principle* of

the *State-Religion* at that time, was *that* with which the *Fathers* primarily charged the *Heathens*, and that in such terms as evidently exclude from their thoughts the Dr's *Chimerical Imagination* of *Relative* worship; as when *S. Athanasius* charges them, for *turning away from the true God, and giving all the honour of the Divinity to the creatures*; *S. Augustin* for giving divine honour *creaturæ, non Creatori*, to the creature, not to the Creator, and *prætermisso vel præterito Deo*, passing by God, *and making Gods of the Elements, in like manner as if one should take the Ship in which he is carried, for the Pilot that governs it*, as *Athenagoras* expresses it. And the *same* is confessed by *Vossius* in his *first Preface*, where he acknowledges that the *Heathens did relicto Deo in naturæ Veneratione consistere*, forsaking God *stay* in the worship of the *creatures*. By all which it appears, that the *Parallel* between the worship of the *Heathens*, and that of the *Church* of *Rome*, like a *House* built of *Cards*, when one of the *Supporters* is drawn away, *falls* down in great confusion. And this is confessed also by *Eminent Doctors* of the *Church*

Orat. cont. Gentes.

De civ. Dei lib. 6. c. 1.

Legat. pro Chr. p. 61.

of *England*; *as Dr. Hãmond*, who makes *the Heathen Idolatry to haue been the worshipping of the many false Gods first, and then of the Images of them*; and then addes, that *those of the Church of Rome are not said or thought to be guilty of the former*. He might haue added, nor vpon the same account of the *latter* neither, for if they do not worship many *false Gods*, they do not worship the *Images* of them. And Arch Bp. *Whitgift*, (whom Dr. St. will by no means suffer *to be thrown away to the Puritans*,) when he makes his *third* kind of *Idolatry* to be, *the worshipping false Gods either in heart, mind, or in external creatures living or dead, and altogether forgetting the worship of the true God*; ingenuously confesseth, that *for all that he can see or learn, the Papists are not in this third kind of Idolatry*.

of Idolatry p. 42.

Dr. St. in his Pref. to Rom. Idol.

Cathar. And I can be contented to *hope* at least with these Learned men, that taking *Idolatry* in *this Sense* the *Paralel* doth not hold with the *Papists*: but yet not so as to free them from the guilt of *Idolatry* vpon another account, if it be true what T. G. saith, that it is *the giving the Soveraign worship of God to a crea-*

ture; For though the *Heathens* gaue *diuine* worship to their Inferiour *deities*, yet they gaue *Soueraign* worship only to the *Supream God*, *and the Martyrs ſacrificed their lives on this Principle, that diuine worship (and not meerly Soueraign worship) is to be giuen to none but the Supream God.* So that either the *Heathens* muſt be *excuſed* from *Idolatry* in what they did, and the *Primitive Martyrs not be deemed ſo wiſe as they might haue been*; Or the *Papiſts*, at leaſt thoſe who give *Latria* to the *Croſſe* and the *Images* of *Chriſt*, muſt be involued in the *ſame crime.* Def. p. 70.

Eun: I cannot eaſily think that the Dr. intended to be *ſerious* when he put in that ſubtil Parentheſis (*not meerly Soueraign worship*) and yet becauſe it is a ſtring he often harps vpon, I muſt not paſſe it by as a *Triſle*, though in reality it be no other, as to the preſent diſpute, whether we conſider it with reſpect to *T. G.* or to the *Heathens*. And firſt for T. G. the Dr. having been ſo charitable to him as *to ſuppoſe him to believe the Supream Being Maker and Gouernour of the world to be the true God*, it ſeems plain to me that he meant the ſame by *Sout-* Def. p. 5.

raign, and by *divine* worship. Nor do I see what ground Dr. St. had to fancy he made any *distinction* between them, when he confesseth the definition of *Idolatry* according to T. G. to be, *the*
p. 4. *giving the worship due only to God to a creature*, more than he has to make him distinguish between *God*, and the *Supream Being*, which in this case is just none at all. For if *God* and the *Supream Being* be adequately the same with him (and I never heard he made more *Gods* than *One*) t'is manifest that by the worship due to the *Supream Being* (that is, *Soveraign worship*) he meant no other than the worship *due to God alone*, i. é. *divine worship*. By this it appears that the distinction had no ground in any thing that T. G. said: It was the Dr's
1 Def. p. 49. Proper Invention; and so *if he please, let it be writ upon his Monument*. that he may not be unprovided of an Inscription, as well as T. G. *Hic jacet Author hujus distinctionis.*

Cathar. But if T. G. intended no distinction by these terms, why does he call it *Soveraign* worship?

Eun: Not to distinguish it from the worship *due* only to the *one true God*,

but with intention to haue avoided, if poſſible, the *Equivocation* the Dr. had brought vpon the word, *divine*, by his applying it to that *Relative* and *Inferiour* kind of worship, which ſome of the School men call *latria* and aſſert to be due to the *Croſſ* and the *Images* of *Chriſt*. And I ſhould haue thought he might haue expected to haue found the Dr. favourable here, after ſo ſerious a Profeſſion that *he loves not to wrangle about words*; but I ſee that rocks ſometimes lye under the ſmootheſt waters: and a man through too much care may fall vpon *Scylla*, whilſt he endeavours to avoid *Charybdis*.

2. As for the *Heathens*, they may indeed be conceived to mean by *divine* worship, not only the worship *due* to their *Supream God Jupiter*, but the honour *due* to any thing, which according to their Erroneous Fancy they believed to haue *true divinity* in it, of which ſort they had good ſtore, whom they believed to be truly and properly *Gods*, as I ſhewed before. But what was this to the *Chriſtian Martyrs*? who were not to regulate their actions by the *Errours* of the *Heathens*, but by the *truth* of

Christianity, which as it believes, that *true divinity* belongs to none but to the only one *Supream Being* so it teaches that true *divine honour* is to be given to none but him. And therefore vpon the same account, that they were bound to Sacrifice their lives on *this* Principle, that *there were no more true Gods but one*; they were bound also to do it vpon that *other* that *true divine worship* is to be given to *none* but the *Supream God*: But then again, what is this to those of the *Church* of *Rome*, who do not believe either the *Saints* or *Images* to be *Gods*, or to haue any *divinity* in them; but give an *Inferiour respect* or *Veneration* only to the former for the *Sanctity* they haue received from the only *true God*, and to the latter for the *relation* they bear to their *Prototypes*, viz the same *true God*, or his *Servants*?

Cathar. I must confesse I was afraid there was something like that we call *Scholastick Fooling* in this *distinction* as applied to T. G. when I first read it. But still there remains a *Scruple* with me, concerning the *Heathens*, and I should be glad you could remove it; how, if they acknowledged *one Supream Being*.

Maker and Governour of the world, they could think any *others* to be *truly* and *properly Gods* beſides him? For this ſeems to me ſo palpable and groſſa *Contradiction*, that nothing that hath the uſe of *reaſon* could fall into it.

Eun: For the *Heathens* contradicting themſelves, I think we need not be much concerned, when we ſee *ſome Chriſtians* can ſo eaſily run into it. But by this *Scruple* of yours, *Catharinus*, I perceive you imagin the *Generality* of them to haue had as *cleer* and *diſtinct* a *Notion* of the *one Supreã Being*, maker and Governour of the world, as the *Wiſe Philoſophers* had, if not as we *Chriſtians* haue now adayes. And this indeed is *what* Dr. St. hath laboured to inſtill into the minds of his Readers, by repreſenting what the *Philoſophers* ſaid of *God*, and the *wiſeſt* too among them, as if it had been the conſtant *belief* of the *Vulgar*, or as if *they* had as thoroughly believed the *firſt* Article of the *Creed*, *I believe in one God Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth, and of all things Viſible and Inviſible*, as *Chriſtians* do. That this was his *Practice*, to dreſſ vp the *Paralel* he intended to make be-

tween *their* worship, and that of the *Church* of *Rome*, is manifeſt frō the very Teſtimonies he cites to prove that the *Heathens* did acknowledge *one Supream Being*; as you haue ſeen already in that of *Thomas Aquinas*, who ſpeaks not there of *the moſt of the Gentiles*, as the Dr translates it, but of the *wiſeſt* of the *Philoſophers*. And the like is to be obſerved in the Teſtimonies he cites out of *Juſtin Martyr*. Def. p. 25. *Athenagoras* p. 60. *Clemens Alexandrinus* p. 76. *Origen*. p. 81. *S. Auguſtin* p. 97. For what theſe *Fathers* alledge out of the *Philoſophers* and *Poets* concerning the *Vnity* of *God* &c. to prove againſt the *common Religion* that more *Gods* than *one* were not to be believed and worshipped, the Dr. very artificially inſinuates into his Reader, as the *Notion* of the *Heathens* in general, as if *they* had as *cleer* and *diſtinct* a knowledge of the *one Supream Being*, as the *Wiſeſt* of the *Philoſophers*. And had this been ſo, ſuppoſing the *Wiſeſt* to haue had a right notion of the *one* only *true God*, it is a hard matter indeed to conceive, how this Judgment remaining entire in them, they could fall into ſo *manifeſt a Contradiction*, as the believ-

ing many *Gods* properly ſo called: or how *Idolatry*, (as the Dr. himſelf obſerves Def. p. 63.) for that *part* of it which *lies in the inward eſteem of our minds*, could conſiſt with ſuch an Acknowledgment of one Supream Being.

But whether this were *poſſible* or no, 1ſt it is nothing to the *Queſtion* we are now vpon, for whether it be or be not, the matter of *Fact* is certain, as I shewed before, that the *Generality* of the *Heathens* did believe and worship *many Gods* properly ſo eſteemed by them, and were vpon this account charged with *Idolatry* by the *Fathers*, which is ſufficient to show the *diſparity* between their *belief* and *practice*, and that of the *Church* of *Rome*, as you heard but even now confeſſed by *divines* of the *Church* of *England*.

2. It concerns not the caſe of the *Vulgar Heathens*, for the *notion* they had of the *divinity*, was not *cleer* and *diſtinct* like that of the *Philoſophers*, who therefore denied *thoſe* whom the People worſhipped to be *Gods*; but rude, confuſe and imperfect, [1] like that of men, who ſee a thing at a *diſtance*, but know not what it is, or [2] like that of *blind men* who

1. *Tertull. li. de ſpect. non poenitus*

feel ſomething of the *Sun's* Influence,[1] but *ſee* not the *body* of *light*,[2] a knowledge not ſetled and cultivated by *ſober* and *ſerious Reflexion*, but conſtrained by the force of *nature*, like the *Natural Teſtimony* of *Conſcience* which the moſt *Atheiſtical* and debauch'd ſinners feel at times, even *againſt* their *Wills*;[3] not a *cleer light* but a faint *glimmering*; In fine,[4] not a *certain* and *ſteady* knowledge of *him* who is the *true* God, but a *General Notion* of *a divine Power*, hanging as it were in the ayr like an *Individuum Vagum*, and ſo *differently applied* by each one to the *God*, or *Gods* he worshipped.

Deum norunt, niſi de longinquo, non de proximo.

2. S. *Aug. Ep.* 110. *ad Honor.* ſicut nec illa lux videtur, oculis præſentata cœcorum.

3. *Lactant. li.* 2. *c.* 1. Adeo ipſa veritas, cogente natura, ab invitis pectoribus erumpit. *Clem. Alex. in Protr.* vel inviti fatentur. *Athenag. p.* 55. vel inviti conſentiunt.

4. *Tertull. ubi ſupra.* Deum non penitus norunt. *S. Aug. Tract.* 106. *in Jo.* Non omni modo eſſe potuit hoc nomen (Deus) ignotum, non omnino ac penitus poſſit abſcondi *Lactant. li.* 2. *c.* 1. Quem prorſus ignorari ab homine fas non eſt.

1. *Tertull. li. de Teſt. Animæ.* ea voce (ſcil. Deus) & aliquem eſſe ſignificas, & omnem illi confitetis poteſtatem. *Clem. Alex. in ſtrom. propeſinem.* Poteſtate quidem Dominus & Deus omnium, cognitione autem non omnium, neque enim id quod eſt, neque quomodo Dominus & Pater & creator, norunt, niſi ab ipſa veritate didicerint. vid. S. *Aug. li.* 1. *de Conſ. Evang. c.* 25.

This is the Account which the *Fathers* give of the *Notion*, which the *Vulgar Heathens* had of the *divinity*, with whom *Voſſius* alſo agrees, affirming the

Li. 1. *de Idol. c.* 2. & 4.

the *knowledge* they had of *God*, to be *confused and undetermined, and that in part they received him, but in part rejected him, so that even when they knew God, they knew him not to be God*. And it cannot be doubted but so *dim* and *imperfect* a *Notion* as this was, would easily be *laid* aside or *forgotten*, where *Fancy*, *Passion* and *Interest* gave Laws to *Reason*, though vpon occasions it would show it self in their words and actions, *against* their *wills*. And what *Errours* would not such *Masters* lead them into, especially under the direction of so *cunning a Sophister*, as the *Old Serpent*? One of the first Propositions he made to our first Parents, was *that they should be like Gods*, inspiring into their minds an affectation of *divinity*. And *they being delighted and pleased with it*, as *S. Augustin* saith, what was the *consequence* like to be in their Posterity, but that they should be seduced to *believe* more *Gods* than *One*.

Cognitus confuse & potentiâ, Ignotus distinctè & actu, &c.

Li. 14. de civ. Dei c. 13.

That *this* was their *belief* de facto is undeniable, and supposing what hath been said of the *confused notion* they had of *God*, that they knew him but *in part*, and that so *rudely*, that the *Apostle* of the *Gentiles* oftentimes affirm-

Gal. 4. 8. 2. Thess. 4. 7.

eth, *that they did not know him*, and the *Inscription* to the *Vnknown God*, will stand as an *Eternal Memorial* of it, it is no hard matter I think to conceive, how they might fall into the *Erroneous Belief* of *many Gods*. For as men who never had seen that *body* of light which we call the *Sun*, beholding only the *beams* he sends before him at his *rising* could not but inferr from thence, there was a *Light* which enlightned the world, but would be to seek whether it were *one* or *many*, or rather apt to believe from what they experienced in sublunary Lights, that *one Taper* alone was not sufficient for the *whole Vniverse*, So though the *Heathens* before the rising of the *Sun of Justice*, could not but see by the *beams* he sent before him in the *Creation*, that there was a *Superiour Power* which governed the world, yet being led wholly by Sense, and judging of *Heavenly* things by what they saw pass in *Humane*, they might be at a loss to know whether this *divine Power* resided in *one* or *many*; or if *one* were *Chief*, whether there were not others, who had the right and power of *Absolute Lords* and Governours over

such and such *things*, or such and such *parts* of the Vniverſe; And not being able to comprehend, how ſo vaſt a *Machin* as Heaven and Earth with the variety of creatures in them, could be governed by *One*, they inclined rather to aſſign him *Partners* in the Government of it, ſome of whom, (as *Godwin* obſerveth in his *Roman Antiquities*) *they fantied to haue poſſeſſion of Heaven by their own Right, and theſe they called Dij majorum Gentium or Select Gods; and others, no otherwiſe than by right of donation, as the Semidei or Indigetes.* *Ii. 2. Sect. 1. c. 1.*

Cathar. You haue given us here *Eunomius* a pleaſant kind of *Hypotheſis*, not unlike *thoſe* invented by the *Philoſophers* to explicate the *alterations* which appear in the Vniverſe, *ſome* of them placing the cauſe of them in the motion of the *Heavens*, others of the *Earth* and others of *both*. But how doth it appear that this was the *Conceit* which the *Heathens* made?

Eun: If a *Second cauſe*, not cleerly and diſtinctly known haue given occaſion to the *Wiſe Philoſophers* to frame ſuch *ſtrange* (and ſome of them ſuch odd) *hy-*

potheſes to explain the common Phænomena of the world, how can it be expected, but that the *Vulgar Heathens*, muſt haue raiſed much *ſtranger* concerning the Government of it, vpon ſo *dim* and *confuſe* a knowledge as they had of the *diuinity*. As for the *Hypotheſis* it's ſelf, of the *Diuine Power* reſiding in *many*, it appears to haue been *theirs* from the *defences* they made for themſelves, when the *Fathers* preſſed them with the abſurdities they run into
Li. 1. c. 3. by aſſerting more *Gods*, than *One*; For as *Lactantius* ſaith, ſome of them ſaid, that *their many Gods were ſuch*, (or as much) *as Chriſtians would haue the one to be*: And others that *they preſided ſo over ſeueral things and parts of the Vniverſe, that there was but one Rector Eximius, Supream Ruler*. And therefore ſpeaking afterwards of the *diuiſion* of kingdomes
c. 11. between *Jupiter*, *Neptune*, and *Pluto*, and having compared the ſhare which fell to *Neptune* to that of *M. Antonius* to whom *the Senate had given the command of all the Sea Coaſt*, he showe'th how the *Poets* (to whom the People as *Varro* ſaith, were apt to give credit) by giving the name of *Heaven* to the *Eaſt*-

ern Part which belong'd to *Jupiter*, and of *Hell* to the *Western*, which was the *Portion* of *Pluto*, and by other Fictions they added, raised it from a *terrene* power to a divine in the Apprehension of the Vulgar; which was the more confirmed in them by the many *prodigious*, but *fallacious signs*, as *S. Augustin* saith, which *Evil Spirits* wrought in their names, and their exacting *sacrifice*, which by the common consent of mankind was held only *due* to *divinity*, to be offered to *them*. Hence the *Question* between the *Heathens* and the *Fathers*, was not whether the *One Supream God* used the *Ministery* of *Angels* to execute his commands, for in this, *Lactantius* saith, *1d. cap.* 7. that the *Christians* were ready to agree with them as to the *thing*, though they denied *those* whom the *Heathens* worshipped to be *those* Angels or *Ministers*; but whether *their many Gods were not the same which Christians would have their One to be*; or as *Minucius Felix* *p. 51. 52.* states the Question to his Friend *Cecilius* *whether the* Heavenly *Empire were governed by the* (undivided) *power and Authority of one or by the Arbitrement of many*; by which he understands, and

'Tu in eo ſo ſummam poteſtatem dividi credas & ſcindi veri illius ac divini Imperij totam poteſtatem?

he underſtood the *Heathens* to do the like, not a *Miniſterial Power*, ſuch as is given to the *Angels*, but *a ſharing of the One true and divine Empire, by a diviſion of the whole Power among many?* And *that* which made them fall into this *Errour*, was as I ſaid before, that they could not comprehend, how the *Vniverſe* could be governed by *one*, but look'd vpon it as the moſt *extravagant* and *Senſleſſ Poſition* in the world, as appears by the *Objection* made by *Cæcilius*, p. 29. *What monſtrous things*, ſaith he, *do the Chriſtians faign of that their One God, when they make him buſily pry into the manners, the actions, the words, and even the Secret thoughts of all men, as one that runs up and down, and is every where preſent. They will haue him to be unquiet, importune, and curious even to Impudence: For they make him preſent to all that is done, and to inſinuate himſelf into all corners, whereas he can neither ſufficiently provide for Each particular, being incumbred with all: nor haue ſufficient care of all, being intent vpon particulars:* Here you ſee the Fundamental *Errour* of the *Heathens* and that which made them multiply the number of their *Gods* with-

out number, *assigning the care of each thing to the proper office of some Deity*, as to the Goddess *Segetia* the care of the *corn* to *Flora* of the *Flowers*, to *Rusina*, of the *Hills*, to *Vallonia*, of the *Vallies*, and so of the rest, which *Varro* affirmeth to haue exceeded *thirty thousand*. And the same *Varro* thought he had done a singular peice of service to the *Romans*, in not only giving them a Catalogue of the *Gods* they ought to worship, but in teaching them also, what was *the particular Power and Vertue of each Deity in order to the Parts of the Vniverse*. For *by this*, saith he, *we may know, what God we ought to invocate for each thing, and not do, as Comedians are wont, when they jest, aske water of Bacchus, and wine of the Nymphs*. A great benefit doubtless, saith *S. Augustin* deriding after his way the *fopperies* of this great man; but withall adding, *that he had deserved thanks indeed, had he showed what was Truth, and taught the One true God, from whom all good things are, to be worshipped by Men*.

S. Aug. li. 4. de civ. Dei. c. 1.

Id ibid. c. 22.

Cathar. You are carefull I see to avoid the *rock* which T. G. run vpon, when citing the Testimony only of good fa-

ther *Origen*, he cry'd out *the Fathers*, *the Fathers*. But admitting all this to be so, as you haue said, I do not see yet how the *Heathens* were chargeable with *Idolatry* in T. Gs. *Principles*, 1. because they gaue but *divine* worship to their *Inferiour Deities*, and *Soveraign* alone to *Jupiter*, 2 because however they imagined the *divine Power* to be *divided* among *many*, yet without doubt what they referred their worship to, was *that* which they had in their minds when they pronounced the word *God*, how rudely soeuer conceived by them.

Eun: Much good may the *Spoils* of such a *wrack* do the Dr. I know none will envy them. But for what you object, to the *first* I answer, that by what *name* soeuer you call the worship the *Heathens* gaue to their *Inferiour Deities*, yet *professing*, as they did, that they worshipped *them* as *Sharers* with *Jupiter* in the Divine *power* and *Authority* and vpon that account believed them to be *truly* and *properly Gods*, in whose *power* it was to *bestow* those benefits vpon them, which they desired, they were justly *charged* with *Idolatry* by the *Fathers* for so doing. For this being a Perfection *peculiar*

culiar to God, that he is *the Sole Author of every good Gift*, the giving worship to *any other* besides him, as a *Sharer* with him in it though but in this or that particular, will be *Idolatry*: And in this consideration, (were there no other) they might be justly charged with it by the *Fathers*. But the case is farr different with those of the *Church* of *Rome*, who believe and profess *every good and perfect Gift to descend from the Father of Lights*, whom they acknowledge to be the *only true God*; and address themselves to the *Angels* and *Saints*, as his *Ministers* and *Servants*, not to *obtain* of *them* the benefits they desire, but of *God* alone by their *Intercession* through his only *Son* and our only *Redeemer Jesus Christ*, as the *Council* of *Trent* hath declared. *Sess. 25.*

As for what you add of the *Heathens* referring their worship to *what* they had in their minds, when they pronounced the word *God*, how rudely soever conceived by them: I answer that as the *Manichees*, though they professed to believe and worship *Christ*, yet for giving that worship to the *Sun*, whom they believed to be *him*, were charged with *Idolatry*: *Manichæi Solem istum oculis carneis visibilem expositum &c*

publicum non tantum hominibus sed etiam pecoribus ad videndum, Christum Dominum esse putaverunt. *S. Aug. Tract. 24. in Jo.*

So the *Heathens* also though they pronounced the word *God*, yet fixing the notion they had of him, vpon *Jupiter*, as the Dr. saith they generally did, (at least the *Greeks* and *Romans*) or vpon the *Sun* as the *Persians*, or vpon the *Soul* of the world as the *Stoicks*, or vpon any other *created* person or thing, they were in like manner *guilty* of *Idolatry*: And the reason of both is, because what the *Manichees* and *Heathens* had in their minds and Intentions to worship was not *Him*, who was the *true God*; but in reality a man, or a *devil*, or some other *creature*, to whom they applied the *notion*, and whom they erroneously, and without reason, believed to be *him*. And here the case also is quite different with those of the *Church* of *Rome:* For they neither believe the *Saints* to be *Gods* nor any *divinity* to be in *Images*, nor *Bread* in the *Eucharist* to be *Christ*, but believe the *Saints* to be but his *Servants*, the *Images* but *Representations*, and the *Bread* not to be at all, but to be *changed* into the *Body* of *Christ*: so that the *Object* of their worship, that is, what they haue in their *minds* and *purposes* to give divine worship to, being no other than

the *one only true God* they can never be justly charged with *Idolatry*, as T. G. hath fully and cleerly shown, *Catho. no Idol. p.* 327. *&c.* As for the *Heathens*, if at any time they worshipped *God* under the general notion of a *Power Superiour* to the Universe, or as *Maker* and *Governour* of the *world*, without placing it vpon any creature, to make that the *Object* of their worship, as it is likely they did not, when they used those expressions, *God sees*, and *I commend it to God*, and *God will restore*, and the like: for then as *Tertullian* saith, they lifted vp their Eyes to *Heaven*, and not to the *Capitol*, and so calls it *the Testimony of a Soul naturally Christian*, I do not find they were charged with *Idolatry* by the *Fathers* in this *precise* consideration; Nor do I see any reason why they should, if they joyned nothing to *that notion* which was *destructive* of it. And thus much I hope may suffice to remoue the *prejudice* you had taken against those of the *Church* of *Rome*, from the imaginary *Parallel* of their worship with that of the *Vulgar Heathens*. I know you haue a mind to be

O Testimonium animæ naturaliter Christianæ. *Tertull. Apol. c.* 17.

doing also with the *Philosophers*, but I shall begg you will let them alone till to morrow.

The End of the Fourth Dialogue.

THE FIFTH DIALOGVE.

THE ARGUMENT.

THe *Dr's* Parallel *from the Prâctice of the* Wiser Heathens, *shewn to be* Un-parallel *vpon many accounts*: *and the Argument from* God's Appropriation *of certain external Acts to his Worship, a meer* Sophism *made vp of* Equivocations, False Suppositions, *and* Self-contradictions, *and after all to* conclude *nothing against the doctrine of the* Church *of* Rome, *or the* definition *of Idolatry given by T. G.*

CATHARINVS, EVNOMIVS.

Cathar. However the *Vulgar Heathens* were such *Fools*, as to believe their *Inferiour deities* to be truly and properly *Gods*, and to worship them as such; yet the *Wiser* of them did not so,

at leaſt the *Platonicks*, of whom *Aquinas* according to your own Interpretation of his words confeſſeth *that they did acknowledge one Supream God, from whom they ſaid all thoſe others, whom they called Gods, did receive their Being, and that they aſcribed the name of divinity to them, in the manner that Holy Angels and men in Scripture are called Gods.* Nevertheleſſ the *Fathers* charged them alſo with *Idolatry* for the worship they gaue to theſe *Gods*, and to their *Images* as *Symbols* and Repreſentations of them. And vpon *this Suppoſition* it is, viz, *that they were not miſtaken as to the Obiects of their worship*, that the Dr urges T. G. to anſwer *whether they were to blame, or no, in the manner of ſerving God by Images, in ſuch a way as they deſcribe.* For if *they* were *not* to blame, the *Fathers* certainly were for charging them with *more than they were guilty of*; and if *they* were to blame, how come thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome* to be excuſed?

Supr. p. 403.

Eun: Here indeed I think you haue driven the *Point* to the head. And admitting the *Suppoſition* to be as Dr. St. would haue it, me thinks T. G. gaue

a very direct *Answer* to the *Question*, when he said that *they were yet to blame upon a double account.* 1. Because the *Images* being instituted by publick Authority for the worship of *false Gods* they concurred, (as the Dr. himself acknowledgeth) with the Vulgar in all the *external* Practices of their *Idolatry*, and consequently were guilty at least of the *exteriour* Profession of *Idolatry.* 2. Because though in the Schools they denied them to be *Gods*, yet as *Origen* answered *Celsus*, (one of the Dr's *wiser* Heathens,) they gave *divine* honour to them so farr, as that the People by their example, who were esteemed Wise and knowing men, were led into *errour*, and their Souls so far depressed with a False Religion that they could not endure to hear any one deny them to be *Gods*, whom they were accustomed to worship. And this saith *Origen* is the crime with which we charge *Celsus*, and all those who confess they are *no Gods.*

» *Cath. no Idol.* p. 108.

Cathar. A very learned Answer doubtless, but as Dr. St. saith hath *not one wise word* in it. For as he tells T. G. *All the Question is, how this External wor-*

Def. p. 468. p. 438.

ship comes to be Idolatry, supposing they acknowledged one Supream God, and gave only a Relative and Inferiour worship to other Beings created by him, or to the Images of them. Wherein I pray did this Idolatry consist?

Eun: A very learned Question indeed, but such as either hath *no Sense* at all in it, or it must be in the present circumstances, how the *Philosophers complyance* with the *Vulgar* in the *External* practices of their *Idolatry*, comes to be the *External Profession* of *Idolatry*? For *Internal Idolatry* being excluded from their minds by the very *Supposition* of their acknowledging *one Supream Being* and giving only a *Relative* worship to *other* Beings, to ask how they come to be guilty of *Internal Idolatry*, will be *non-Sense* at best, if not a perfect *Contradiction*. T'is to the Question then in the former Sense, viz how the *compliance* of the *Wiser* Heathens with the *Vulgar*, comes to be an *External Profession* of *Idolatry*, that T. G. is to answer; and I think there needs no more than a litle *Mother-Wit* to do it. For this *External worship* being given to those who were believed by the *Vulgar*, to be truly and

properly *Gods*, and were by publick Authority worshipped every where as *such*, t'is manifest I think to any man of the meanest Understanding, that whatever esteem the *Wiser ones* had of *them*, or however they directed their *Intention*, yet the *complying* with the People, (who were *internally* also *Idolaters*) in all the *external* Practices of their *Idolatry*, and that in such a manner, that they were judged to do that *really*, which they did but *counterfeit*, was at least an *Exteriour Profession* of *Idolatry*; as much as, and indeed much more than going to *Church* once a month here in *England*, and doing all other *Religious Actions* exteriourly as *Protestants* do, whatever the *inward* Sense of the Doer be, is an *Exteriour* Profession of *Protestantism*. This is a very cleer Solution of the Question as I take it in T. G's. *Principles*, who makes *Internal Idolatry* to depend vpon the *Intention* or Interiour acts of the *Understanding* and *Will* terminating the exteriour worship vpon something, as esteemed worthy of divine honour, which in reality hath no Excellency in it to deserve it. For as the doing of this is true *Internal Ido-*

latry, and *External* alſo, ſo the *complying* with thoſe who do it, in the manner before expreſſed, will be an *External* Profeſſion of *Idolatry*. But it were worth the while to know how the Dr. will ſolve the Queſtion in his own Principles; For it being *Idolatry* according to him, *to make any thing ſo farr the Object of Divine worship, that Men do bow down before it*, it muſt be ſo either in the *nature* of the thing, and then *Bowing* before the *Altar* alſo will be *Idolatry*; or by vertue only of the *Poſitive Law* of *God*, and then the *Heathens* who did it to their *Idols*, were not vpon that account guilty of Idolatry, becauſe not under the *Law*.

Cathar. I ſhall not digreſſ at preſent to anſwer for the Dr. But if this be all the *defence* you can make for T. G. in anſwer to this *Queſtion*, viz that the *People* had *other notions* of the *Falſe Gods*, than the *Philoſophers* had, and yet *theſe* latter alſo were juſtly charged with *Idolatry* for complying with the People in the *external* acts of worship; I think you haue brought the buſineſſ home enough to the *Papiſts*, and in particular to T. G. himſelf. For as Dr. St. hath well obſerved vpon this anſwer,

This is just the *Case of the Roman Church*: *Their learned men have complained that the People worship the Images as* Gods *among them. But doth* T. G. saith he *think himself guilty of external Profession of Idolatry in using the same external acts of worship with the People, though with another Intention? If not, why shall not the same excuse hold for Titius, which holds for Sempronius?* Def. p. 435.

Eun: Were the *case* the *same*, it were but reason the *same Excuse* should hold or not hold for both. But here the *case* is *so different* that nothing but the *Admirable Faculty* which the Dr. hath of making *Parallels* could haue put *them* together. For supposing the matter of the *complaint* to be true, what *consequence* is it, because the *publick custome* among the *Heathens* of worshipping *Jupiter, Juno, Venus* &c *as Gods*, made it an *Exterionr Profession* of *Idolatry* in some *private* men to *comply* with them in their practices; therefore the *abuses* committed by some *private* men in the *Church* of *Rome*, where the *Publick Profession* is quite *contrary*, make the *common custome* to be an *Exterionr Pro-*

feſſion of *Idolatry*? A wider *Conſequence* ſurely was never ſeen. But with your leave, *Catharinus*, I ſhall give you a caſe in the Church of England, much more paralel to the Dr's. than his of the *Divines* of the *Church* of *Rome* to that of the *Philoſophers*. And it is this. Some learned men of the Reformation haue complained that not only the *People*, but the *Wiſer ſort* make an *Idol* of the *Altar* in making it *ſo farr the Object of Divine worſhip as to bow down before it.* But doth Dr. St. think himſelf guilty of *external Profeſſion* of *Idolatry* in uſing the ſame *External* act of worſhip with them? If not, why ſhall not the *ſame excuſe* hold for *Sempronius*, that holds for *Titius*?

Cathar. Methinks you haue as good a *faculty* in making *Paralels*, as the Dr. But I pray tel me, *Eunomius*, what excuſe can thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome* give for themſelves, which the *Philoſophers* might not haue given? Will they undertake (as Dr. St. there addes) to defend the *follies* of the Ignorant people? No. They do not think themſelves bound to do it, but blame them for their *ignorance* and *Superſtition*, and ſay *the*

Church is free, becauſe it hath taken care to inſtruct them better. And might not the *Philoſophers* have ſaid the very ſame thing? We are not bound to anſwer for the madneſs of the rabble; we inſtruct them better, and our *Schools* are open for them to learn: But ſince the *nature* of ſuch actions depends vpon the *Intention* of the *Doers*, we declare our *Intention* to be to *honour* the *Supream God* in the firſt place, but all others whether *Celeſtial Deities*, *Aerial demons*, or the *Souls of deified men* with a worſhip *Inferiour* to his: And according to the *worſhip* we give to the *Beings repreſented*, we give worſhip to the *Images* or *Repreſentations*. And if you allow the diſtinctions of *Divine* worſhip into *ſoveraign* and *ſubordinate*, into *abſolute* and *relative*, what *harm* is there in all that we do? Indeed, if it be *unlawful* to Worſhip *God* by an *Image*; if it be *unlawful* to give any *divine worſhip* to any *creature*, we are then to *blame*, and are juſtly condemned; other wiſe we think we *ſtand* vpon *equal* terms, with thoſe who make uſe of the ſame *diſtinctions*, and only change the *names* of ſome, and the *Perſons* of others. Thus T. G. may

Def. § 456.

» ſee the *Parallel* is not ſo *extravagant*,
» as he would make it to be.

Eun: Here it is we haue another of the Dr's *Figures* of *Rhetorick*, but grounded vpon as many *falſe ſuppoſitions* almoſt as there are *words*: as 1ſt that the *Follies* of the People of the *Church* of *Rome* are *equall* to thoſe of the *Heathens*, that is, that they believe the *Saints* to be *truly* and *properly Gods*, *chãging only the names of ſome, and the Perſons of others*, and give worship to their *Images* as ſuch. 2ly That *they* are propoſed as ſuch by the *Profeſſion* of that *Church*, and their *Images* publickly *Inſtituted* to be worshipped on that account. 3ly That the *Philoſophers* took as much *care to inſtruct the People better*, by their *Publick Profeſſions*, *Catechiſms*, and *Sermons*, as the *Divines* of the *Church* of *Rome* do. 4thly That thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome* give the ſame *external acts* of worship to the *Saints*, which the *Heathens* did to their *Inferiour deities*, as ordaining *Prieſts*, offering *Sacrifices*, and performing other *Religious Rites*, which by the *publick cuſtome* of that time, and the *common conſent* of mankind, were underſtood to be due only to

true divinity. 5thly That *the Philosophers* used the distinctions of *Soverain* and *Subordinate*, *Absolute* and *Relative* worship in the *same Acts*, and with the *same* determination of *circumstances*, as to the *Exteriour* Profession of *Idolatry*, which those of the *Church* of *Rome* do. 6thly That the sole *Intention* of the *Doers* is according to T. G. *sufficient* to free them from it. 7thly That it is *unlawful* to worship the *true God* by any *Image*. 8thly That it is *unlawful* to give *any divine worship*, (though equivocally so called because given for his sake) *to any creature*. When the Dr. hath *proved* all these *Suppositions*, and they *must* all be proved to make the *Parallel* hold, it will be time for him to tell us, *that the Philosophers stood upon equal terms* with those of the *Church* of *Rome*, as to the *Exteriour* Profession of *Idolatry*, which is the *Point* we are now upon; till then he must give me leave to think the *Parallel* is altogether as *extravagant* as T. G. would make it.

Cathar. The concern I see you have to free the *Papists* from the note of *Idolatry* makes you seek and catch at every petty *circumstance*, though never so

remote and *Invisible*, which may seem to make a *difference* between *them* and the *Heathens*. But when all is done, you will never be able to *save* them. For if there be some peculiar external acts of worship appropriated to God, the giving of them to any creature, as the *Papists* do to *Saints* and *Images*, will be not only an *exteriour Profession* of *Idolatry*, but very *Real Idolatry*. For as Dr. S. saith very well, *It belongs to God to appropriate acts of worship to himself, and having appropriated them they become due only to him: And therefore they who do those Acts to any besides himself do give to the creature the worship due to God alone, which is the very definition of real Idolatry T. G. contends for.*

Def. 7. 269.

Eun: I cannot deny, but that I have as great a concern to see any *Christians* charged *with more than they are guilty of*, by Dr. St. or any other; as himself hath for the *Fathers* doing it, as he supposes, to the *Heathens*: for as I told you before, *I love not to see People represented worse than they are.* And besides I see, that whenever the matter is brought to a tryal, those of the *Church* of

England will be forced to make uſe alſo of the diſtinctions of *Soveraign* and *Subordinate*, *Abſolute*, and *Relative* worship to ſalve the *Reverence* or *Religious reſpect* as I may call it, they shew to Holy *Places* and *things*, and particularly that of *bowing* to the *Altar*, for the *Relation* they haue to *God*; and the *Philoſophers* will ſtand as much vpon *equall terms* with *them*, as with thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome*; of which I haue giuen you a ſufficient *Specimen* in the *agreement* as to this matter I shewed there was between the Dr. himſelf and *Card. Lugo*. See Pages 228. 229. 230.

But now for this *mighty* Argument of *God's appropriation* of external acts to his worship, although I haue already shown the *ruine* it throws vpon the other Argument he draws from the *Practice* of the *Heathens*, or rather how it ſerves for an *Apology* to free them from the note of *Idolatry*; yet becauſe I ſee you think the Dr. hath done *wonders* in it againſt thoſe of the Church of Rome, I ſhall let you ſee that the only thing to be wonderd at in it, are the many *Equivocations*, *falſe Suppoſitions*, and *ſelf-cõtradictions* contained in it And *Supra.* p. 148. &

to proceed with greater clearneſſ, pray tell me what it is you underſtand by *Gods appropriating* Acts of worship to himſelf; for *more* or *leſſ* may be required, and ſo the *term* be *Equivocal*.

Cathar. What I underſtand by it, and what I ſuppoſe Dr. St. means, as appears to me from his own words, is 1. *God's appointing certain external acts to be uſed in his worship*, 2. *his tying us to perform them to him*, and 3. *reſtraining us from doing them to any other*; For by his *appointment* and *command* they become *due* to him; and by his *Prohibition* to give them to any other they become *due only* to him.

Def. p. 270.

Eun: This is a very cleer *deſcription* ſo far as it goes, but ſtill methinks there is ſomething wanting to make the Argument *concluſive*, againſt thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome*, and that is, that *God* hath ſo *tied* theſe acts to his own worship, that in *all caſes*, and vpon *all accounts* imaginable they become *incommunicable* to any other, and this ſo *faſtned* to them, that it cannot be *ſeparated* from them. For if in *ſome caſes*, or vpon *ſome accounts* they may be communicable to *others* beſides *God*, *Sempronius* may

come in for his *Share*, as well as *Titius*, and if the *Appropriation* may be *ſeparated*, the *Romaniſts* may and will pretend it is.

Cathar. I do not remember that *this* is any where *expreſſed* by the Dr. but I ſuppoſe it is ſufficiently *implied* in the *three* forementioned *conditions*, for I do not ſee how the *argument* can *conclude* without it.

Eun: But here then, *Catharinus*, either you are *miſtaken*, or the Dr. *contradicts* himſelf, when he affirms, that *although the outward acts be the ſame* (for example of *bowing* or *kneeling* &c) *yet the external circumſtances which do accompany mens acts, are thoſe which do ſo circumſcribe and limit them, that from thence they become either Civil or Religious.* For if they may be communicable to *o hers* beſides *God*, as limited with ſuch and ſuch *Circumſtances*, they are not *abſolutely* appropriated to *God* in *all caſes* and *upon all accounts* imaginable; and ſo the *Argument* does not *conclude*, but leaves the *Romaniſts* at liberty to plead as much for the lawfulneſs of *bowing* to *Images*, from the Circumſtances or upon the *Account*, with which they do it, as *Def. 9. 192. 193.*

the Dr. thinks himself to be for the lawfulness of *bowing* to the *Altar*. Hitherto then we are to seek what it is the Dr. means by *God's appropriating* acts of worship to himself, farther than as he saith, it is his *tying* us by his *Command* to perform them to himself, and *restraining* us from doing them to any other. But it may be some farther *light* may be gathered from the *Acts* themselves. Pray what are they?

Cathar. The Dr. reckons six, viz; *Sacrifice, Religious Adoration, Solemn Invocation, Erecting Temples and Altars, Burning of Incense, and making Vows.*

Eun: He might haue added more if he had pleas'd as *Swearing* by the *name* of *God*, Instituting of *Festival days*, and the like: But do you not think he hath reckoned *too many* already. What think you, *Catharinus*, hath God *tied* us by his *command* to offer *Sacrifice*, or *burn Incense*, or make *Vows* to him? I do not believe *you* will grant he hath, nor the Dr. neither. What kind of proceeding then is it in *him* to argue the *Romanists* guilty of *Idolatry* vpon the *Account* of giving *acts appropriated* to God to others

beſides him, when himſelf, if put to it, will deny that God hath *commanded* them to be done at all to him?

Cathar. But the *Papiſts* acknowledge them to be *due* to *God*, and all *external* acts of worship *due* to God, being *forbidden* to be given to creatures, t'is an Argument, as you call it *ad hominem* againſt them.

Eun: But the ſame *Papiſts*, as you call them, do not give to *creatures* thoſe acts which they hold *abſolutely due* to *God*, nor any other, as they are *due* to God, that is, as they are ſigns of the inward ſubmiſſion of our minds to him, but as they are *not appropriated* to God, that is, as they are ſigns of an Inferiour reſpect and Veneration, and ſo the *Argument* is not *ad hominem* to them, unleſſ you can prove that *God* hath *commanded* them to be given to *himſelf* and *forbidden* them to be given to *any other* in *all caſes* and vpon all accounts whatſoever, and then that they give them *ſo appropriated* to any creature.

Cathar. This I think is ſufficiently plain in the Law of *Moſes*, and of *Chriſt* alſo: becauſe, as the Dr. hath well obſerved, *Acts appropriated to the wor-* p. 261. 262.

ship of God by his own appointment, muſt continue ſo, till himſelf hath otherwiſe declared, and Chriſt hath no where made it lawfull to give any acts that were before appropriate to the worship of God, to any creature.

Eun: As for the Law of *Moſes*, not to enter into diſpute about *Particular* acts (as that of *Bowing*, which is an external Act of *Adoration* and yet was done by the *Jews* to the *Ark*) I anſwer in general that not any thing of *that Law* being obligatory to any beſides the *Jews*, preciſely as commanded by *that Law*, but as it was contained in the *Law* of *nature*, and the *force* of *that Law* being taken away by the Promulgation of the *Goſpel*, t'is evident it can oblige *Chriſtians* no otherwiſe than in vertue of the *Law* of *nature*, unleſſ ſome *expreſſ command* or *Prohibition* of *Chriſt* intervene: And therefore whatever is not obliging, by the *Law* of *nature*, or ſome ſuch *expreſſ* declaration of the *will* of *Chriſt*, is left at liberty for the *Church* to uſe conformably to the *Light* of *Nature*, and the *deſign* of *Chriſts* doctrine. For as Dr. St. now vpon ſecond thoughts ſaith, *In the worship of God, all things*

Supra. l. 47.

are lawful that are not forbidden. As for what you urge, that *Christ hath no where made it lawful to give any acts that were before appropriate to the worship of God, to any Creature*, it is but a *Negative* Argument from *Authority*, and of no force, especially in the present case, where a *Positive* declaration is necessary.

Cathar. And such a one I shall give you: For as the Dr. saith, *Christ hath not only no where given the least Intimation, that any Acts which before were peculiar to God, may now be given to any else besides him; but instead of this he lays down the same Fundamental Precept of worship which was in the Law, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve: And he explains it more clearly to avoid all ambiguity in it, by expressing that restrictive particle only which was imply'd before.* Def. p. 162.

Eun. But what is this, but to thrust the *sword* into his own *Bowels?* For if the Argument be good, he must confess himself obliged to offer *Sacrifice*, and *burn Incense*, and make *Vows* to *God*, which I believe he will not do. For *this*, as now managed by the Dr. is a *Point*

that concerns not only those of the *Church* of *Rome*, but *all Christians*, if the *Precept* be to be understood as a *Re-establishment* of those Acts, in the *new Law*, which he saith, *were before peculiar to God* in the *old*, and *Christians* will be as much tied by vertue of *this Precept* to give them to *God*, as *not* to give them to *any other*. But if the fore mentioned particular *Acts* of *Sacrifice burning Incense*, &c be not re-established by this *Precept*, what *Consequence* is it, that they are forbidden to be given to any other besides God, because they were *appropriate* to him in the *Law* of *Moses*, the force of which Law is now taken away by the Preaching of the Gospel? Surely *none* at all, unless he will acknowledge those very acts to be *due* to God by the *Law* of *nature* also, or vpon some *other* account than that of the *Law* of *Moses*.

By what hath been said, you see what a *Mass* of *Equivocations*, *False suppositions and self-Contradictions* are here jumbled together by the Dr. not un like the Ingredients of the *Poets Chaos*, *non bene junctarũ discordia seminarerum*, to make vp a peice of *plausible Sophistry*

phistry to surprise such as are carried away with the *sound* of words, and are not *able* or *willing* to penetrate into the sense and meaning of them. But that which is most of all to be admired, is that admitting the *Argument* to be *good*, it proves nothing against those of the *Church* of *Rome*, who neither give any act *absolutely* appropriated to *God* to *any* else besides him; nor *any other* in the *manner* it is appropriated to him. For the *Appropriation* they had or may be supposed to have had by the law of Moses being taken off by the *Abrogation* of *that* law, and no *new one* produced by the Dr. in the *law* of *Christ*, as hath been shown, those of the *Church* of *Rome* cannot be convinced of *Idolatry* for *those* they use towards Saints and Images by vertue of *any Appropriation* from *any positive* law of *God*. The *Argument* then you see such it is, whether *good* or *bad* concerns not those of the *Church* of *Rome*.

Cathar. But I hope it concerns T G, for supposing the fore-mentioned *Acts* to be *due* to *God*, the *giving* all or any of them to any besides himself will be to give to the *creature* the worship *due* to *God* alone, which is the very definition

real *Idolatry* T. G. contends for.

Eun. To this I answer, that supposing (not granting) the fore mentioned external *acts* to be now due to God by *his law*, the giving them to *any* besides himself will be to give to the creature the *worship due to God*, if it be done with an *intention* to give them to a *creature* as esteemed worthy of divine honour; I grant it is the very *definition* of *real Idolatry* which T. G. contends for. If without such an *intention* I deny it: For as it will not be Real *Religious worship*, but *fictitious* to give them to God himself, if it be not done out of a true esteem of his *supream excellencie* as worthy of it, So to give them to *any* else besides him without an *intention* to do it out of a *false esteem* of the *object's worthiness*, will not be *real Idolatry* in the nature of the thing but *Fictitious*, though from the Appropriation they have by the *law* of *God*, (Supposing such a *law* to be in force) or *other circumstances*, it may and ought in reason to be *interpreted* to be *real Idolatrous worship*, as an *Hypocritical* act of worship may and ought from the *circumstances* to be esteemed *truely* and *realy Religious* till the cõtrary

be made evident. And the reason of this is, because *Idolatry* is a sin directly *opposite* to *Religion*, as a *False worship* to a *true one*, not as *Hypocrisy* which counterfeits to worship the *true God*, (and the Dr himself if you remember distinguishes *it* from *Idolatry*, though how agreably to *his Principles* I know not:) nor as worshipping the *true God* after an *unlawfull* manner, for no man I think will condemn the *Iews* at present of *Idolatry* for worshipping the *true God* with the *Rites* and *ceremonies* of the *Law* of *Moses*: but (to use the words of an eminent diuine of the *Church* of *England* *Dr. Taylor*) *as a forsaking the true God and giving divine worship to a creature, or to an Idol, which* saith he, *is that kind of superstition, which by divines is called the superstition of an undue object.* And thereupon acquits those of the *Church* of *Rome* from the *guilt* of *Idolatry* in the worship they giue to the *Host*, in case they should be *mistaken* in their belief of the *Bread* being changed in to the *Body* of *Christ*: because *the object of their Adoration (that* saith he, *which is represented to them in their minds and thoughts and purposes in the B. Sacra-*

Lib. of Proph. Sect. 2. n. 26.

ment) is the only true and Eternal God hypostatically joined with his Holy Humanity. Hence though the Divines make Idolatry, as I said to be directly opposed to Religion, yet they say that concomitantly it is opposed to Faith, or supposes an Errour in Faith. For as Card. Tolet hath well observed, as there is not the true worship (which is Religion) unless Faith be supposed in the understanding by which we acknowledge the Excellency of the object (God) to which we submit our selves: So also there is not the false worship which is Idolatry, unless there be a precedent errour in the understanding by which we judge that to deserve divine honour which doth not. And this is so manifest that the Dr. himself confesseth it was well observed by the Cardinal, that although Idolatry do suppose an Errour in the mind, yet that Errour lies in judging that to deserve divine honour which doth not: and grants it may be consistent with the belief of the supream Excellency of God. By which I see (to use his own words) that after all he is a good natured man too, and although he will shew a thousand tricks, rather than be thought to have it forced from him, yet let him alone, and

Sa. Cas. lib. 4. c. 14. n. 4.

Def 1. q. 6

p. 276.

he will give us, much as a man would desire. For what could T. G. *wish* for more than he here *grants*? 1. that the *Error* which *Idolatry* supposes, lies in *judging that to deserve Divine honour, which doth not.* And 2. that *it may be consistent with the belief of one supream God.* For the former destroys the chimerical notion of Idolatry he contends for, [viz *of an Image, being made so farr the object of divine worship that men do bow down before it, in case God have forbidden it by his law*] for now it is not *Real* with him, unless it be done out of an *erroneous judgment* as to a thing that *deserves* divine honour. And the latter quite overthrows the *Parallels* he draws from the *practice* of the *Heathens*, because it being now *granted* by him, that the *Erroneous belief* of a creatures *deserving* divine honour when it doth not, may be *consistent* with the *belief* of *one supream God*, if the *vulgar Heathens* did believe *those* whom they worshipped to *deserve* divine honour, (as most certainly they did) their case is manifestly *different* from those of the *Church* of *Rome*, who do no such thing. And if *Idolatry* suppose such an *erroneous belief* in the mind, the

meer giving *external* acts of worship to a *creature* without such a judgment in the *Wiser* Heathens, could not according to him be *Real Idolatry*, but *Fictitious* only and *Hypocritical*. And it is very observable, that when he first *began* this *controversy* he did not charge *all those* of the *Communion* of the *Church* of *Rome* absolutely with *Idolatry*, but that *they must be guilty either of Hypocrisy, or Idolatry either of which*, he saith *are sins inconsistent with salvation*; which sufficiently insinuates he thought the *meer external compliance* with those who were truly *Idolaters*, not to be *real Idolatry*, but *Hypocrisy*, though by reason of the *circumstances* it might and ought to be *presumed* to be *real*. But then again in case the Dr. with all his subtilty could make it out to be *real Idolatry* to give *external acts* of divine worship to a *creature* or an *Idol*, meerly for fashion's sake, or out of fear, or some other Passion, without such an *Erroneous judgment*, it would signify just *nothing* to those of the *Church* of *Rome*, who neither give external worship to *those* who are falsly believed to be *Gods*, and commonly worshipped as *such*; nor

any Act appropriated to *God* by *his law*, either *absolutely*, or in the *manner* they are appropriated to him whilst the Appropriation lasts, as hath been shewed. Finally it appears to me after all, that all that *dust* which the Dr. hath raised to make it seem *Idolatry* to giue to a *creature* external acts of worship *appropriated* to *God*, comes at length to be a *dispute about words*, for as much as concerns the cause of the *Church* of *Rome*; For Whether it be *Idolatry* or no the *thing* which the Dr. himself means by the *word*, and of *which* he accuses the *Church* of *Rome*, is confess't by the *Romanists*, themselves to be a *sin inconsistent with salvation*, and if the Dr. can prove them guilty of it I shall confess he hath done his *own work* and *theirs* too.

Cathar. In this I think you haue *reason*, for this would be sufficient to make all those who haue a care of their *Salvation* to abhorr their *Communion*. And I shall endeavour at our next meeting, (which I intend shall be our last upon this account,) to make it appear from *Principles* laid by the Dr. that they are guilty of *damnable sin* at least, if not of *Idolatry* for giving to *creatures* Acts ap-

propriated to the worship of *God*.

Eun; This I confesse will be to smite the *Church* of *Rome* under the *fifth* ribb if it can be proved. But in the mean time I hope you will remember how all the fine things which the Dr. hath said of God's *appropriating* external acts of worship to himself, as, *that it belongs to him to doe it, and having done it, they become due to him; and being become due to him, must continue so till himself hath otherwise declared*; and that in stead of declaring *otherwise*, he hath confirmed the Appropriation anew by laying down the *same Fundamental Precept* of worship in the *new law* &c if they be of *any force* at present to make it to be *Idolatry*, to *bow down* before the *Image* of *Christ* with intention to worship him by it, they will have the *same force* to conclude the practice of *bowing* to the *Altar*, to fall under the same crime. For if *bowing* be one of the *Acts* which God hath *appropriated* to his own worship; and having *appropriated* it, it becomes *due only* to him. They who do this Act to the *Altar* do give to the *creature* the *worship* due to *God* alone which the Dr. saith *is on all sides confessed to be Idolatry*: So

necessary it was for the Dr. to haue taken the caution which Mr. Thorndike gives to those who will be charging the *Church* of *Rome* with *Idolatry*. *It is necessary* saith he, *to prouide, that we contradict not our selues.*

Cath. And therefore, I confesse, were I as the Dr. I would not so much as *nod* with my *head*, to it, much lesse *worship* it with my whole *Body*.

Eun. Perhaps you may *scruple* the having either of them done to your self; and so with out farther *Ceremony* at present I bid your farewell.

The End of the Fifth Dialogue.

THE SIXTH DIALOGVE

THE ARGUMENT.

THe *Church of* Rome *not justly chargeable either for not reserving* any *External* Act *of* Religious worship *proper to* God, *or for giving any appropriate to God, to* Creatures. *The Dr. unhappy again in his citing of* Card. Lugo; *and his arguments from the* Text. Matth. 3. 10. *and the term*, Religious worship, *solved by his* own *distinctions. No succour to his cause from the determination of* Circumstances, *as assigned by him.* Mr. Dailés *doctrine, that* signs instituted by men to signify any thing, t' ough of Religion, are to be interpreted by the publik Practice of those who use them, *a very* Just Discharge *to the Dr's unjust Charge of* Idolatry, *in the particular Instances, of Invocation, Erecting Temples burning Incense, &c. as they are practiced in the Ch. of Rome: and T.* Gs. *Answer to the Dr's old Scruple*, why Sacrifice may not be used to the Saints, in like maner os other External acts are, *shown to have been pertinent and satisfactory.* A Friendly Advice *to him out of St. Augustin.*

EVNOMIVS. CATHARINVS.

Evn. It was *agreed* between us as I remember, at our last parting, that although those of the *Church* of *Rome* could not be convicted of *Idolatry*, yet if they could be proved guilty of *damnable sin* in the manner of their worship, it would be sufficient to make all those who have a care of their Salvation to *abhor* the *Communion* of that *Church*. But how this can be made out I am yet to seek. For particular *Abuses* that may happen, they are not the subject of our *preſēt* debate; but speaking of the *doctrine* of the *Church* of *Rome* in her Councils, and the *practice conformable* to that doctrine, I do not remember that Mr. *Thorndike* any where chargeth it with *sin*, if rightly *understood* and put in practice *accordingly*. If you have met with any thing in the Dr. which you think evinces it, I pray let me hear it.

Cathar. Enough I think and more than enough; For a man may sin against the vertue of *Religion* two manner of wayes; either *by not giving to God the*

worship due to him, or by giving the worship due only to him to creatures. And I take those of the Church of Rome to be guilty in both. For 1. as Dr. St. saith, Def. p. 119. although in the general they confesse that there ought to be some peculiar acts of Divine worship, as most agreable to Gods incommunicable Excellencie: yet when they deliver their minds freely, they reserve no one act of External Adoration as proper to God, and to be performed by all Christians, as Cardinal Inge, he saith, expressly affirmeth, whom he the rather mentions, because of his great Authority and Eminency, and writing since the rest. 2. They give all the external acts of Adoration to Saints and Images, which they do to God, where as the doing of this is absolutely forbidden by Christ himself, when he said Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve; which was certainly understood of an External act of worship, for the devil had said to him Fall down and worship me: A place so Evident that it blinds the Papists with the light of it. p. 104. p. 139. Matth. 3. 10.

Eun. Here Catharinus, to be sure not to miss, you have loaded your Gun with a double charge. But still I see no Execu-

tion done, the former only cutting the *Ayr*, and the latter losing its force against the *hard* wall. To make this clear, I shall lay down these *three Postulata*, and I call them so because I think the Dr. himself will not deny them.

The First is, that the *Law* of *nature* teaching, that *man* ought to use some *External acts* to testify his submission to *God*, there ought in reason to be some *peculiar external Acts appropriated* to the worship of *God*, *as most agreeable to his incommunicable Excellencie.* See Dr. St. *Def.* p. 198.

The 2. That the *Appropriation* which any such *External acts* had only by the *Law of Moses*, being taken away by the *ceasing* of that *Law*, they are left to their *own nature*, unless *appropriated* anew by the *Law* of *Christ*, or some *lawful Authority* under him. *Ibidem.* p. 202.

The 3. That the *Church* having *Power to decree Rites and Ceremonies*, where nothing doth appear *contrary* in the Law of *Christ*, it belongs to her also to *declare* the *Use* and *Signification* of them: and if after this any *Scrupulous Conscience* boggle at the doing of them, The *Advantage* is on the *Churches* side, and *her Authority ought to overrule the* 39. Art. Art. 20. Dr. St. Def. p. 869. and in his Anſ. to N. O. p. 268.

practice of those who are her members.

These things supposed *cleer* and *undeniable*, as being either *expressly* asserted, or *implied* by the Dr. in the *Places* cited in the margent, I answer to the *double charge* you have made: that the Word *Adoration*, as the Dr. himself hath observed, (and by this at present as well as some other *distinctiõs* he afterward gives the world may see he knew very well how to *answer* his *own* Arguments though he thought fit to leave the *Application* of them to others:) The word *Adoration*, I say, may according to him, be taken either *for all the External Acts of Religious worship*, as John 4. 20 Acts 8. 27. (as it is usually taken by *Controversists* in the matter of *Idolatry*, which may be committed in them all.) Or it may be taken more strictly, (as it is in the disputes of the *Schools*) *for that Act of Religious worship which is performed by the motion of the body*, as *bowing, kneeling, Prostration*. and the like. If it be taken the *first way* it is certain, that those of the *Church* of *Rome* haue *one external Act* at least of Religious worship proper to *God*, viz the *Sacrifice* (as they call it) of the *Masse*, or the *Oblation* of

Def. p. 223.

the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ* our Lord in the Eucharist, which they deny may be given to *any* creature, and whereas the Dr. cites *Cardinal Lugo*, asserting *that there is no one external act of Adoration which is proper to Latria, or the worship peculiar to God*, the Jesuits will say that he evidently abuses both his *Authority* and his *Eminency*. For the *Cardinal* doth not say this, as denying *Sacrifice* to be an *external act of worship* proper to *God*, (which is what the Dr. insinuates by his unfaithfull relation of his words) but because he thinks it not properly an *act of Adoration* as taken in it's stricter sense, but of *another kind* distinct from it, yet so that he acknowledges it to be truly and properly *an act of Religious worship*, and such an one to use his own expresse words, *qui non potest offerri nisi soli Deo, as may not be offered but to God alone*. So unhappy is the Dr in his citations to say no worse at present: and I can not but wonder to see you after so much Experience to build any thing upon them. But who is there, that will take the pains to compare them? The *Romanists* then haue *one external Act* of *Religious worship* viz *Sacrifice* which

De Myst. Incarn. disp. 34. n. 24.

they acknowledge so *proper* to *God*, that *it may not be offered but to him alone*, And I see no reason, why the *Solemn Prayers* they make, at the time of offering the *Sacrifice*, to *God* as the *Supream* and only *Author* of *our being*, and *giver of every good and Perfect Gift*, (many of which are inserred in to the *Liturgy* of the *Church* of *England*, and are esteemed the *Principal Part* of the *Religious worship* she gives to *God*,) may not by the *Institution* and *Use* of them in *that Church* to *God* alone, be reckoned for *another*. And so the *Church* of *Rome* hath *one external act* of Religious worship appropriated to *God*, if the *Eucharistical Sacrifice* be truly and properly such, as they say it is, more than I believe you will allow the *Church* of *England* to have.

But then, if *Adoration* be taken in the stricter sense *for those acts of Religious worship which are performed meerly by the motion of the body*: they may be understood either *all of them* to be *absolutely* so appropriated to *God*, that it is not lawful upon *any account* to give any of them to *any other*, and then the *Quakers* will be the only *Christians* in the world

world not chargeable with *sin* for doing them *especially when there is no necessity at all of doing them* to any other; as Dr. St. agreably to the *Genius* of that people objects to T. G. vpon a like occasion. Or only *some* of them and not others, as *kneeling* and *prostrating* but not *bowing*: And then the Dr. must tell us what makes the *discrimination* between the one and the other. Or they may be understood, as *qualified* with such a determination of *circumstances*, as makes them to be *signs* and *tokens* of the worship *proper* only to *God*: and then those of the *Church* of *Rome* deny they give *any such* to any but to *God*: and think they are as much at liberty to use them toward *Images* or *Saints*, whē they are understood by the Churche's declaration, as *expressions* of an *inferiour worship*, as the *Church* of *England* is to use *bowing* to the *Altar*; and why *kneeling* or *prostrating* may not be so *circumstanc'd* as well as *bowing*, I do not understand. As for the words of *Christ*, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve*, which you say are *so evident that they blind the Papists with their light*, I grant they were un-

Def. 8. §. 4. n.

derstood not only of an *Internal but* an *External act* also: but *the Occasion was such as* the Dr himself tells us, *as required no respect of any other kind*: And who is so blind as not to see, that the *Prohibition* of the *Law* fell upon it as determin'd to be a *sign of Religious worship* by the *circumstances* in which it was required. And consequently where there is *no* such a *determination* of *Circumstances*, the *Law* is not concerned.

p. 232.

Cathar. I like not these *distinctions* of yours *Eunomius*, nor indeed any *distinctions* at all, where *God* interposes in the case: for I see if we admit *any*, we shall be driven at last to submit to the *Judgment* of the *Church*, rather than of any *private* man: and this will spoile all. *Hath not God forbidden any Religious worship to be given to any besides him when he commands that all Religious worship without distinction be given to himself*, as it is plain he hath by that Law, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve. And where the Law doth not distinguish what presumption is it in us to do it?*

Def. 97 250. 25

Eun. This is another excellent Principle of the Drs to uphold the *Quakers* in

their absurd fancy of denying to give any *External honour* to a *creature*. And although he call this a *Venemous insinuation* in T. G. yet it follows clearly from the *general Principle* vpon which he goes for if the *Law* commandeth *all worship* to be given to *God* alone *without distinction*, *what presumption* will they say *is it in us to distinguish* between *Civil* and *Religious where the Law doth not*? But what matters it whose cause we vphold, if we can but throw down that of the *Church* of Rome? And yet I do not so much wonder at this in the Dr. as to see him presume to *distinguish* where the *Law* doth not, even in *Religious worship*, when *God* himself, as he saith, hath commanded that *all Religious worship without distinctiō* be givē to himself. For it is he that tells us, that *worship* may be said to be *Religious* two wayes. 1st. *as it is required by the Rule of Religion and so the worship given to Magistrates is Religious*. 2. *In its nature and circumstances, as it consists of those acts which God hath appropriated to his worship, or is attended with those circumstances which make it a* Religious *performance, and thus it is not to be given to*

p. 319.

p. 322.

Princes or any creatures, but only to God himself. So that here we have two sorts of *Religious worship*, the one *properly*, the other *improperly* so called. In like manner he acknowledges that the *Reverence* given to *Holy Places and Things* may be called *a Religious Respect upon account of the Relation they have to God.* Again *the honour*, saith he, *we have for the Saints may be called Religious honour, because it is upon the account of those we may call Religious Excellencies, as they are distinguished from meer natural Endowments and Civil Accomplishments.* And now if the *divines* of the *Church* of *Rome* when they call the *Respect* they give to *Saints* and *Images Religious*, declare they do it not, but upon some of the fore mentioned *accounts* given by the Dr. viz either *as those External Acts are required by the Rule of Religion*, or for *such Excellencies* as he grants *we may call Religious*, or *for the Relation* the things to which they are given have to *God*, which is the very reason himself gives, why *that* may be called *Religious respect*, which is given to the *Altar*, I would gladly know why the *same distinction* may not be allowed to

Def. p. 603. p. 287. 251.

Sempronius, which is to *Titius*.

Cathar. The *reason* I conceive is because nothing will serve the *Papists* for their *Saints* and *Images* but *Religious worship*, and although the Dr. do grant that the *Reverence* given to *Holy Places and Things* may be called a *Religious Respect*, and the *Honour* we give to the *Saints* a *Religious Honour*; yet he will not admit of *Religious worship* to any but to God alone, because that includes *submission* as to a *Superiour*. And accordingly where *he calls that a Religious Respect*, which was given by *Nebuchadnezzar* to *Daniel* Dan. 2 46. he saith it was done *out of an Opinion of great sanctity without superiority*. So also he grants *that the meer External Act of Adoration in bowing or kneeling may be given both on the account of Excellencie and superiority, as some of the Patriarchs he saith bowed to Angels, as a token of honour of their Excellencies, and not out of Religious worship: and men may bow and kneel to their Soveraign Princes on the account of Civil worship: and Children to their Parents in token of their subjection to them, as well as Creatures to their Creator in their solemn Acts of*

p. 132.

p. 193.

devotion, but, he saith, *that in all these cases, the different signification of these Acts is to be gathered from the Circumstances of them.*

Eun: Here *Catharinus* you have heaped many things, or rather *words* together. Among the rest you say, the Dr. will not admit any *worship* to be called *Religious*, but what is *due* to *God* alone. And I dare undertake the *Church* of *Rome* will never refuse him *Communion* for it. For where I pray, do you find, that that *Church* hath declared *Religious worship* to be *due* to *Saints* and *Images*? There is no such Expression in any of the *Decrees* of her *Councils* obliging those of her Communion so much as to *call* it so: nor any mention at all made of it in them. And if some of the *Schoolmen* use that term, it is (as they declare themselves) upon some of the *former accounts* acknowledged by the Dr. himself to be sufficient to give the denomination of *Religious*, as of *Relation* to God or the Saints when done to *Images*, or of some *Supernatural Excellencie*, when given to *Saints*. But I do not see why according to his own Principles there may not be a *Religious worship due* upon some

account to a creature, as well as a *Religious Reſpect*, or a *Religious Honour*. For, may there not be a middle kind of *Superiority*, as well as *Excellencie*? *Such* I take the *Authority* of *Biſhops* to be, *whom the H. Ghoſt*, as the Apoſtle ſaith, *hath placed to govern the Church*; not *Divine*, becauſe that is incommunicable to any creature, nor meerly *Civil* or *Natural* becauſe not founded vpon any ſuch Accounts, but of a *middle* rank or nature between both. And if the *honour* giuen for *Such* an *Excellencie*, may be called *Religious honour*, why may not the *worſhip* due to ſuch a *ſuperiority* be called *Religious worſhip*? The Dr. indeed tells us, that when *Nebuchadnezzar fell vpon his face and* worſhipped *Daniel*? he did it *out of an Opinion of great Sanctity without ſuperiority*: But it is but *his ſaying*, and the *Intentiõ* of the giver being *ſecret*, I wõder how the Dr. could know *ſo preciſely* how farr it went: and the more, becauſe the *Proſtration* there giuen was an act of *Adoration*; for the Text ſaith not that he honoured, but that he *worſhipped Daniel*, and then addes withall, that *he commanded that they ſhould offer an*

Oblation and sweet Odours (or Incense) *to him*, which by the consent of mankind at that time were understood to be *acknowledgments* of *superiority*. But to let that passe; Put case, that *God* had constituted *Daniel* the *God* of *Nebuchadnezzar* as he did *Moses* the *God* of *Pharaoh*, in that case I suppose the act of *Prostration* might have been given vpon the account of his *Superiority*, as well as *Sanctity*, and so would have been an Act of *Religious worship*, as given vpon account of *Superiority*, which was neither *divine* nor *Civil*; as well as of *Religious Respect*, because given vpon account of *such* an *Excellencie*.

Again, the Dr. granting (as he doth,) that the meer *External Act* of Adoration in *bowing* or *kneeling* may be given both on the account of *honour* and *worship*, i. e. vpon the account of *Excellencie*, as when some of the *Patriarchs* bowed to *Angels*, and of *superiority*, as when men bow and kneel to their *soveraing Princes*, and *Children* to their *Parents*, and that in all these cases the *different signification* of those acts is to be gathered from the *Circumstances* of them, I would gladly know, why an act

Account

of *Religious worship* given vpon the Account of such a *superiority* as I haue described, may not be discerned, not to be properly *Religious*, as well as an act of *Religious Respect* upon the account of a *like Excellencie*? But how comes the Dr. after all the great bustle he makes about *God's* appropriating external acts of worship to himself, to put the Tryal of his cause at last upon the determination of *Circumstances*? I confess he must needs see it would come to *this* at length, all *Appropriation* by vertue of the *law* of *Moses* being taken away, and no expresse *declaration* of the Will of *Christ* produced by him, appropriating them anew. But then again he could not be ignorant how *hazardous* is must be for him to venture upon it: For if *the External* acts of worship given to *Creatures* in the *Church* of *Rome* chance to prove accõpanied with *such Circũstances* by which they may and generally are understood *not* to be Acts of *divine* worship, but of an *inferiour Veneration*, I do not see but that they are to be acquitted not only of *Idolatry*, but of *sin* in doing them, according to the Dr's

own Principles.

Cathar. Here you touch upon a *Point*, wherein the Dr. comes vp *close* indeed with the *Papists*, and vtterly confounds them. For as he hath well obſerved, *the worſhip* for example I giue to the King, *doth not take its denomination from my Intention, but from the nature of the Act, which being Civil, the worſhip continues to bear that name. By which we ſee*, ſaith he, *that the External circumſtances, which do accompany mens Acts, are thoſe which do ſo circumſcribe and limit them, that from thence they become either Civil or Religious.* And he freely acknowledgeth, that *there is the ſame nature in theſe Acts, that there is in words of different ſignifications, which being taken in general are of an Equivocal ſenſe; but being conſidered with all their particular circumſtances, they haue their ſenſe ſo reſtrained, and limited, that it is eaſy to diſcern the one from the other. That therefore*, ſaith he, *we call Religious Adoration which is performed with all the circumſtances o Religious worſhip, as to time, place, occaſion, and ſuch like; as if men uſed proſtration to any thing within the Courts of the*

Def. p. 192.

p. 231.

Temple (wherein some of the Jews thought that posture only lawful,) If it were done in the time of Sacrifice or devotion: if the Occasion were such as required no respect of any other kind, as when the devil demanded of Christ to fall down, and worship him. In these and such like circumstances, we say, saith he, *that Adoration hath the determin'd signification of Religious worship, and is an appropriate sign of it by Gods own Institution.* And upon this account it is, that he charges those of the *Church* of *Rome* for the *Adoration* they give to *Saints* and *Images* by bowing, kneeling, &c. in the *Church*, and in the most *solemn Acts* of *devotion.*

Eun. This is one of those *Popular* discourses which take much with the Vulgar. But how *impregnable* soever it may appear to those who judge of things by the *show* they make, yet upon *Examination* it will be found as *incoherent* and *weak* as an Adversary would wish. For 1. If it be true, as the Dr. saith, that *the worship takes it denomination from the nature of the Act*, I confess I do not see, how it *follows* from *thence*, (though the Dr. say *he doth*) *that the External Cir-*

cumſtances which do accompany men's acts, are thoſe which do ſo circumſcribe and limit them that from thence they become either Civil or Religious. Thoſe who haue but *peeped through Ariſtotles key-hole*, (as he ſaith) tell us that *Acts* take their *nature* from the *formal Reaſon* or *Account* upon which they tend to their Objects, and that from *thence* they become either *Civil* or *Religious*, though they may receive another *denomination* from the *circumſtances* which do accompany them. But I queſtion much whether the meer Circumſtances of *Time*, and *Place*, and ſuch like, as aſſigned by the Dr. be ſufficient in the preſent caſe to give *ſuch* a denomination. For

2. If theſe be the *Circumſtances*, which do *ſo reſtrain and limit the ſignification of External Acts, that it is eaſy to diſcern one worſhip from another*, how will he make it out, that the People did not give *Religious worſhip* to *David*, when in a moſt *ſolemn* Act of *Devotion*, wherein *David having bleſſed the Lord before all the Congregation* and exhorted the People to do the like, ſaying, *Now Bleſſ you the Lord God*: it follows imme-

1. Chron. 29. 10.

diately. *And all the Congregation bleſſed the Lord God of their Fathers, and bowed down their heads, and worshipped the Lord and the king.* Where we ſee the *ſame act* and at the *ſame time*, a *time* of *ſolemn devotion*, given to *God* and the *king*, and the People never charged for giving *Religious worship* to the king.

3. In caſe the firſt *Chriſtians* being met together to *pray*, and *St James* their *Biſhop* paſſing by, they ſhould haue kiſſed the hemme of his garment, and deſired his *Benediction* in the poſture they were in upon their *knees*, (and the ſame is of a *child* at his *Prayers*, to his *Father*,) I cannot think that the Dr. himſelf, had he been preſent, would haue condemned them of *damnable* ſin for it, or even ſcrupled the doing of it himſelf.

4. When *Naaman* deſired to be permitted by the *Prophet to go with his* Heathen *Maſter into the houſe of Rimmon* (of which I ſhall give you a farther account by and by out of Dr *Hammond*,) and *(when the maſter worship'd there, and lean'd upon his hand) to bow in the houſe of Rimmon*, the *Prophet* bad him *Go in peace*; which ſurely he would not haue done, had the *very bowing* in the

house and *presence* of an *Idol*, and in the very *time* of *worship*, been *Religious worship* or *Idolatry*.

5. The External Act of *bowing* to the Ark among the *Jews* was, and to the *Altar* in the *Church* of *England* is performed in the *time* and *place* of *divine worship*, and yet the Dr. denies *them* to be *Religious worship*; 'tis not then from *those Circumstances* precisely that worship becomes *Religious*.

6. Lastly, *if there be the same nature in these Acts, that there is in words of different significations*; as those *words* being *differently applied*, may bear the *same* significations in *Religious* matters, which they do in others, whether they be spoken in the *Church* or *else where*; in the *time* of *divine service*, or *out* of it; as the word *Father* applied to *God*, or to *him* from whom we received our Being under *God*, or the word *Light* applied to *Christ* himself, or his *disciples*; or the words, *Give*; *Help*, &c. applied to *God*, or to *Angels* and *men*; and the same is of the words, *Advocate*, *Mediator*, *Intercessor*, &c. as applied to *Christ*, or to *Holy men*: As these, I say, and the like *words* being *thus* differently applied bear the *same* significations in *Religious* mat-

ters, which they do in others; So also the *Acts* of *bowing*, *kneeling* &c. being differently applied, may signify the *same* in the *time* and *place* of *Religious worship*, as being so applied they would do out of it, as you haue seen in the *Examples* before alledged, of the *People* to *David*, of *Naaman* to his *Master*, of the *Jews* to the *Ark*, and of *Christians* to the *Altar* in solemn Acts of *devotion*. And consequently, although the *Circumstances* of *time* and *place* may contribute in due occasion to show the *difference* of one Act from another; yet it is, as they stand under *other Qualifications*, which afford a *sufficient* Ground to judge of the *nature* of the *Acts*, whether they be *Civil* or *Religious*, and whether *properly Religious*, or *improperly* only, for some *Excellency* or *Superiority* not meerly *Natural* or *Civil*. And those are. 1. The *different Obiects* to which they are applied, as to *God*, or the *Saints*, or the *King*, &c. 2. Some Publick *Profession* or *Protestation*, manifesting that they are applied to such *Objects* upon *different accounts*. 3. The *common consent* or *Vse* by which *such Acts* are generally understood to be applied to *such Objects*, upō

such different Accounts. And where those three conditions concur, they give sufficient ground to make a different judgment of the Acts, be the Circumstances of time and place what they will, as Dr. Hammond himself confesses in the afore-mentioned case of Naaman. For having observed, as he doth, (and he saith it is an Ordinary Observation) that Aliens, Proselytes of other nations were not bound to that strictness of submitting to every rite and positive precept of the Law, as the Jews were, instancing particularly in that of not bowing to the king in the presence of an Idol, which the Jews he saith, at least accounted themselves obliged not to do, (and supposing it to be the Common custome and practice in Syria to pay

of Idol. § 29. 30.

" Veneration, even Prostration to the king,
" he tells us, that Naaman was permitted
" by the Prophet to go with his Heathen
" Master into the house of Rimmon, and
" (when the Master worship'd there, and
" lean'd upon his hand) to bow himself in
" the house of Rimmon 2. kings 5. 18. upon
" this ground, 1. that he never wēt into the
" Idol-Temple, but to wait upon his
" Master in the Office which he had. 2.
" that he profess'd himself to all (even to
that Heathen Master, and those that

were in his Court) to be a worshipper of none, but of the *true God*; and to that end carried two mule-loads of earth out of Palestine with him v. 17. in honour of him, whose *name was great there*, and to build an Altar according to the Prescript Ex. 20. 24 by which it was sufficiently clear to the beholders, (as by an Interpretative Protestation) that when his Master worshipt, he only *bowed* and then his *bowing* was only *Civil* to his *Master the king*, not *Religious* to *Rimmon* or *Saturn*, or his *Image* there. And therefore to his Question, whether God would be offended with him in that matter, the Prophet answers him with a [*Go in peace.*] I cannot think so irreverently of the Prophet, as that he should make that answer *Ironically* to his *new Convert*, (any more then I can believe *Naaman's* scruple belong'd only to the former part of his life (reading it in the Præter sense:) For sure *that* had been guilty of the worshipping the *Idol*, and not only *bowing in the house of Rimmon*:) but that he meant in earnest, what alone the words import, that in this doing, and no more, he need not fear that he should be a breaker of *that law*, which in this particular was not given

to him, or any, but those of that Nation, or People of the *Jews*. Where you see that the whole *Resolution* of the case in the iudgment of that Eminent divine of the *Church* of *England*, depends upon the *three* afore-mentionned conditions of the *Object* to which the act of *bowing* was applied, the *common practice* in *Syria* of paying that *Veneration* to the *king*. and a *Publick Protestation* that he intended not *that worship* to the *Idol*, but to his *Master*, and not on the *Circumstances* of *time* and *place*, which in that occasion were *over-ruled* by those other. The Fundamental *reason* of this is given by *Monsieur Daillé* an Eminent divine of the *Reformed Church* in *France*; and because his Authority may sway much with you, I shall give it in his own words. *Signs*, saith he, *instituted by men to signify any thing, whether of nature or Religion, are to be interpreted by the publick and common practice of those who use them, and not by the secret and particular Intentions of this or that Person. I grant*, saith he, *that of themselves and of their own nature, very many of them do not signify one thing more then another; and that those which have a na-*

Apol. c. 14. p. 118.

tural relation to the things signified, have it not so necessarily annexed to them, that it might not have been lawfull frō the beginning to have us'd them otherwise. But after that the Will of man, which is the Mistresse of such Institutions, hath addicted and dedicated them to a certain signification, and Publick Vse hath confirm'd it, I averr, that afterwards to use them in another sense is Intolerable Impertinency, and that he that so uses them, is to be accounted for a Fool and a Lyer among all Wise men &c. Thus Monsieur *Daillé*.

And now to come to the case of the *Church* of *Rome*; Although the *Romanists* do give those External acts of *Adoration*, which are performed by the motion of the *body*, as *bowing, kneeling*, &c. to *Saints* and *Images*, and that in the *Church*, and in the *solemn acts* of devotion: Yet these *Signs* being *such* as of their own nature are *Equivocal*, and so subject to the will of men, and there being extant a *Publick Profession* of that Church, and *that* confirmed by the Publick and common *Practice*, not only of the *Roman*, but of the whole *Christian* world before *Luther*, (and of the

far greater part of it ſtill,) that when applied to *Saints* or *Images*; they are uſed as *Tokens* or Expreſſions of an *Inferiour reſpect* or *Veneration*, I ſee if we *mete* with Monſieur *Daillés meaſures*, it can be no other than *Intolerable Impertinencie*, to reſtrain and limit them to *another* Senſe, and They who will needs take them in ſuch a *reſtrained* ſenſe, that they may charge thoſe who uſe them in the *manner* aboue declared, with *Idolatry* or other *damnable Sin*, will fall within the number of thoſe who by *his verdict* are to be accounted for *Fools* or *Lyers* among all Wiſe men; At leaſt if we *weigh* with Mr. *Thorndike's Weights*, they muſt be guilty of a ſtrange *Uncharitable* Opiniatorneſſ *in ſuppoſing them to contradict themſelves.*

Cathar. I confeſſ, if it be true what Mr. *Daillé* ſaith, that *Signs inſtituted by Men to ſignify any thing, whether of Nature or Religion, are to be interpreted by the common and Publick Practice of thoſe who uſe them*, I do not ſee but the *Papiſts* haue as *fair*, (if not a fairer Plea,) that they ought to be underſtood in the *Senſe* they *declare* themſelves, as the *Church* of *England* hath for *bowing*

to the *Altar* by it's declaring; that *they intend not thereby to give any Religious worship to the Communion Table.* For if *Number* and *Continuance* weigh any thing in this *Case* (as certainly they ought in such *Institutions* as depend upon the *Will* of *men*) I conceive the *Publick Profession* and *Agreement* both of the *Eastern* and *Western Churches* for so many ages together in performing those *external acts* of *Adoration* towards *Saints* and *Images*, will out-weigh without comparison the *Declaration* and *agreement* of the *Church* of *England* for *bowing* to the *Altar*. But then again, What *colour* soever you may pretend from the *Will* of *Men*, (which you say, is *the Mistress of such Institutions*) to smooth over the practice of the *Papists* in giving such External Acts of *Adoration* as are performed by the motion of the body, as *bowing, kneeling*, &c. to *Saints* and *Images*, (they being in their own nature *such* as the Dr. grants may be used to *God* and the *creature*): Yet this will not serve for those *other acts* of *Religious worship*, as *Sacrifice*, *Building of Temples and Altars*, *Burning of Incense*, *Solemn Invocation*, *and making*

of Vows, which *God* himself hath *appropriated* to his own worship. *And who dares alter what God himself hath appointed?*

Def. p. 261.

Eun. No man surely I think will be so *hardy*: but then we ought to consider, *how* and in *what* manner the *appointment* is made. Otherwise the Proposition [*who dares alter what God hath appointed?*] crudely and unlimitedly taken, as it is put by the Dr, is that very *Principle*, vpon which the *Anabaptists* ground themselves for *not swearing*, and the *Quakers* for not calling any man *Master*. For if *God*, say they, haue commanded *not to swear at all*, and forbidden his disciples to be called *Masters*, *who dares alter what God himself hath appointed?* But this by the by, to let you see what *kind* of *Principles* the Dr. makes use of to combate the *Church* of *Rome*.

As for the *Objections* themselves, although they haue been answered a hundred times over by those of the *Church* of *Rome*, yet because you press them anew, I answer, that the *Appropriation* which *all* or *any* of these acts are supposed to haue had *only*

by the *Law* of *Moſes*, being taken away by the *ceaſing* of that Law, as I ſhewed before, and no *new appropriation* or Prohibition by any expreſs Law of Chriſt produced hitherto by the Dr. they are to be reckoned in the number of thoſe *Rites* and *Ceremonies* which the *Church* hath power to *decree* and uſe as ſhe iudges expedient, and *their ſignification* is to be taken from the *Publick Profeſſion* and *Agreement* of thoſe that uſe them. *No new* Appropriation, I ſay, *produced by the Dr.* which I deſire you to obſerve, becauſe *thoſe* of the *Church* of *Rome* maintain their *Sacrifice* of the *Maſſe*, to be of *Chriſt's* own Inſtitution, and ſo not to be given *to any Creature.*

Here then it is, that we are to conſider in *what ſenſe* it is that *thoſe* of the *Church* of *Rome* give the *reſt* of theſe external acts to the *Saints.* For the *Will* of *men* being the *Miſtreſſ* of *ſuch Inſtitutions*, they ought both in reaſon and Charity to be underſtood, as they *declare* they uſe them: This I think cannot be denied by the Dr. himſelf, when to iuſtify the *lawfullneſſ* of *bowing* to the *Altar*, he appeals to the *declaration* of

the *Church* of *England*, as your self but even now observed. Let us then see in *what sense* it is that these acts are used by those of the *Church* of Rome to the *Saints*. And

1. For the *Invocation of Saints*, they *declare* they mean no more by it, then having recourse to their *ayd* and *assistãce* to *obtain* by their *Intercession* Benefits of *God* through the merits of his *only Son* and our *only Redeemer Jesus Christ*.

2. For the *building of Temples and Altars*, they *declare*, that the *structures* so called, may be considered, either as *Places* designed for the offering of *Sacrifice* and so they erect none but to *God alone*, as they offer *Sacrifice* to *him* alone, though in *memory* and *honour* of the *Saints*: Or as more *Noble Monuments* to preserve their *Reliques* and *Memory*, and more *affectionately* implore their *Intercession*. And that they are commonly called *Temples* or *Churches*, and *Altars* from the relation they have to the *Sacrifice*, which is offered in them to *God alone*, and that *Solemn Invocation* which is made to him, as the *only Giver of every good and perfect Gift*.

3. For

3. For the *burning of Incenſe*, the *Appropriation* it had by the *Law* of *Moſes* being taken away, and *Idolatry* extirpated, which made uſe of it as an act of *Religious worship* to *Falſe Gods*, (both of them ſufficient reaſons, whilſt they ſubſiſted, for *Hezekiah's* breaking to peices the *brazen ſerpent*, when he ſaw the people offer *Incenſe* to it) and ſo the *act* left to its own *nature*, which the Dr. himſelf grants to be *the ſame with that of the outward acts of Adoration*, and that T. G. was ſo farr in the right when he ſaid, that *burning of Incenſe was a Ceremony of the like nature with bowing*, thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome declare* that they do not uſe it to *Saints* and *Images* as a ſign of *Religious worship*, but either as a *Ceremony* to ſignify the *ſweet odour* the *Prayers* of the *Saints* are, or the like: or as a *token* of an *Inferiour reſpect* and *Veneration*. Def. p. 141.

4. Laſtly for *making of Vows*, they *declare*, they do not *promiſe* any thing to the *Saints*, in the *ſame ſence* they do to *God*, but what they *promiſe* to *God* they promiſe in token of *Gratitude* as to the Author and *Giver* of all good things; and what they *promiſe* to the *Saints*,

they promise only in token of *Gratitude* to them for their *Intercession* to *God*.

Now whatever *Cavils* men of the *Critical* Employment may make against this manner of using either these *acts* or *words*, and how many *casts* soever they may give us of their Office from *Etymologies* or the like, 't is manifest that the *Publick Profession* and common *Practice* of those who *use* them, will *over-rule* all. For after that th se kind of *signs* are addicted to *such* a signification by the *will* of *men*, which is *the Mistress of such Institutions*, where no *Appropriation* is made by *God*, and *Publick use* hath confirm'd it, I confess I do not see but it must be, as Mr. Daillé saith, *Impertinency* or *Folly* to *limit* and *restrain* thē to *another* sense. Nor is this to *alter what God hath appointed*, as Dr. St. obiecteth against *Bellarmin* when he confesseth that *the name of Vow is always taken in scripture for a promise made to God*. For *what* God hath *appointed* is not that we shal not call a *Promise* made to a *Saint* in token of Gratitude for his intercession, a *Vow*: but that we shall not make any such *Promise* to thē as the *Authors* or *Givers*

Def. p. 259.

of the *benefits* we haue *received*, or expect to receive by their *Intercession*; nor that we shall not call a *structure* erected in *Memory* of a *Saint*, a *Temple* or *Church* from the *Sacrifice* and *solemn Invocation* that is offered in it to God, but that we shall not erect any *such* to offer *Sacrifice* to the *Saint*, or invocate him as Author of what we aſk: it In like manner what *God* hath *appointed*, is not that we shall not perform ſuch other acts to *Saints* as may ſerve to teſtify the *Reſpect* and *Eſteem* we haue for the *Excellencies* they are endowed with (and the ſame is of *Images* for the *Relation* they bear to *God*) but that we shall not give them to any beſides himſelf, as *tokens* of that *inward ſubmiſſion* of our *ſouls* which is *proper* to him; or as they may rationally be *underſtood* to be *ſuch*, which I do not conceive can ever happen in the caſe of the *Church* of *Rome* towards *Saints* and *Images* whilſt there is extãt a *Publick Profeſſion* of that *Church* determining and declaring them to be uſed to them, as *tokens* only of an *Inferiour Reſpect* or *Veneration*, and the *Practice* ſuppoſed *conformable* to the *Profeſſion*; which we muſt neceſſarily do, *unleſſ* as

Juſt Weights ch. 16.

Mr Thorndike ſaith, we will ſuppoſe them *to contradict themſelves*: And then the whole *Queſtion* will be, whether their *Adverſaries* words are to be taken before *theirs*, that is, whether their *Adverſaries* underſtand what they *mean*, better than they do *themſelves*?

Matth. 21. 23.

Cathar. Here *Eunomius*, I think I may ſay to you what the *Prieſts* and *Elders* did to *Chriſt*, but with a great deal more reaſon: *By what Authority do men theſe things? And who gaue them this Authority?* For if this be not to *alter* what *God* hath *appointed*, and to put it in the *Power* of man to *change* thoſe things which *God* hath made *peculiar* to himſelf, I know not what is.

Luke 18 29.

Eun: And here I think I may ask you *a like Queſtion* to that which *Chriſt* made to the man that called him *Good*, *Why calleſt thou me Good? None is good, ſave one that is God?* By what *Authority* do you give the name of *Good* to a *man* whom you eſteem *Righteous*, and ſometimes for faſhion's ſake too, if *God* haue *appropriated* the name of *Good* to himſelf? Again if *God* haue expreſſly *forbidden* to call any man *our Father* upon the *earth*, by what *Authority* do you

Matth. 23. 9.

give the name of *Father* to any man upon the earth? And if he have *forbidden his disciples* to be called *Masters*, by what *Authority* do you take it your self, or Dr St. give it to *the Reverend Master Baxter*? When you have answered these *Questions*, *Catharinus*, you will see, and perhaps *confess* what hitherto you would not, that the *different* applying of *words*, (and it is the same of *acts* in their own nature *Equivocal*,) is not to *alter* what *God* hath appointed, nor to put in the *Power* of man to *change* what *God* hath made *peculiar* to himself, but to leave them to *God* in the *Sense*, in which they are *appropriated* to him, and apply them only in *another sense* to the *Creatures*. v. 101

Cathar. This I confess is more than hitherto I *reflected* on. But still there is *one thing* behind which seems to *defeat* all that you have said, and if you can give me a *satisfactory Account* of it, I shall give you no farther trouble. And it is, why the *same* may not be done in *Sacrifice*, that is, in *other* External acts of worship as *bowing* or *kneeling*, *Erecting of Temples*, or *burning* of *Incense*? *Why may it not be made common as well*

Def. p. 259. p. 257. p. 230. *as Vows*. And though it be offered only *absolutely* to *God*, why may it not be offered *relatively* to the *Saints* or *Images*? In a word, *I desire to know* with the Dr *how a sacrifice doth come to signify this absolute worship more than Adoration?*

Eun: This is a *Scruple*, which hath troubled the Drs *notions* from the beginning; and because he *repeats* it so often in his *Defence*. I perceive you think it hath *not* been answered. But I am of another mind. For, if you remember, though T. G. tell him, *that he will better understand it, when he is become a Proselyte*; yet withall he saith, *that in the mean time it may suffice him to know that the Church of God hath no such custome*; and *that Sacrifice is used and taken by the Publick Vse and Custome of the Church for an acknowledgment of the absolute worship due to God, and not of Relative to an Image*. And I do not see why he might not haue been *satisfied* with *this Answer*.

Cath. no. Idol. p. 192.

Cathar. I cannot but *wonder* to hear you say so. For as the Dr replies very home upon him: *I do not ask*, saith he, *whether the Church of Rome haue any*

Def. p. 257.

such custome (the Church of God I know hath not) but whether it may not haue that, as well as some others, and upon the same grounds of Relative worship. But if I must not understand this till I become a Proselyte, I hope I shall be alwaies contented with my Ignorance. If I can be no otherwise informed, I am not sorry to see such Evidence of their Inability to answer, who make such put-offs.

Eun. And I cannot but *wonder* more, why the Dr. should call that a *Put-off*, which seems to me to be a very *Pertinent Answer* to the Question, for as much as concerns the *Dispute* between him and T. G. And that you may see this more clearly, let us suppose T. G. to haue *admitted*, that *possibly Sacrifice* might be used, in *like manner* as *other* external acts are; *all* the Dr could inferr from thence to his purpose would be, that in *such case* the *Church* of *Rome* might *possibly* haue *no* external act of worship appropriated to *God*, if she haue none but *Sacrifice*; but whilst she hath no such custome *de facto*, as offering *Sacrifice* to *Saints* and *Images*, but to *God* alone; tis manifest he cannot accuse them in that point of having *no External Act of*

worship proper to God, or of giving it to any besides him, which I take to be sufficient to repell the Drs charge of *actual Idolatry*; and why T. G. was bound to any more unless men must be condemned as *actual Idolaters*, because it is *possible* they may be so; or what design the Dr proposed to himself by demanding *more*, I do not understand.

Cathar. The *design* was, as I conceive, to provoke T. G. by often casting this *Question* in his way to give some *reason*, why *Sacrifice* might not be applied to *creatures*, in like manner as *other External Acts* are. For whatever *reason* he should give, why this may not be *lawfully* done in *Sacrifice*, would equally show the *unlawfulness* of doing it in the rest: And therefore the Dr so earnestly presses *to know how a sacrifice doth come to signify this absolute worship more then Adoration*, that is, *bowing*, or *kneeling*, or such like acts performed by the *motion* of the *body*?

Def. p. 230.

Eun. This was a *Cunning device* indeed, but such a one, as it seems T. G. was not afraid to speak to. For he tells the Dr 1st *that Sacrifice in general is both by the customs of the Church, and the*

Cath. no. Idol. p. 319.

consent

conſent of all mankind (*as St Auguſtin teacheth*) *appropriated to ſignify the abſolute worſhip due only to God.* And 2^ly for the *particular* Sacrifice of the *Body* and *Blood* of *Chriſt*, *the nature and dignity thereof*, he ſaith, *requireth that it be offered to God alone*. And this I take to be a very *plain* and *poſitive anſwer*, how a *Sacrifice* doth come to ſignify this *abſolute worſhip* more than *Adoration*. But ſince the Dr. is not ſatisfied with it, I muſt deſire you when you ſee him next, to tell him that a *Friend* of yours deſires to know, why *Invocation* (which *he* will haue to be as much the *Proper* act of *Religious worſhip* in the *Church* of *England*, as thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome* account *Sacrifice* to be) may not be applied to *Creatures*, as well as *Supplication*, which *St Paul* reckons among the acts of *Religious worſhip* due to *God*; and why *that* may not be made *common*, as well as *God*, and *Father* and *Maſter* are, which by *Chriſt's* own command in the *new Law* are appropriated to *himſelf*. He cannot recurr to *Nature*, becauſe he knows *words* do not ſignify *naturally*, but by the *Will* of men, and

De Civ. Dei lib. 10. c. 4.

p. 138.

Phil. 4. 6.

are frequently *changed* by cuſtome. If he haue recourſe to the *Impoſition* and *Cuſtome* of *men* determining the word *Invocation* to ſignify that *ſort* of addreſſ which is proper to *God*; thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome* haue the *ſame* and in a more *Vniverſel* manner, for a like *determination* of the external act of *Sacrifice* in general to ſignify the *abſolute worſhip of God*. If to *God's Inſtitution*, they acknowledge the *ſame* for the *Sacrifice* of the *Body* and *Bloud* of our *Lord*, which, they ſay, was inſtituted by *Chriſt* himſelf at his laſt ſupper. Laſtly if he fly to *diſtinctions*, *Sempronius* will think he hath as much *right* to make uſe of them, as *Titus*.

Cathar. This is another of thoſe you call *Arguments ad hominem*. But ſtill methinks you come not up to *what* the Dr would haue: If *Sacrifice* do ſignify the *Abſolute worſhip* of *God* more than *Adoration*, is it for that *of it ſelf* it doth *more properly* ſignify our inward and total *ſubjection* of our ſelves to *God* than the *other* doth? Methinks as the Dr ſaith, *it would become T. G's learning to inform us in this matter.* Def. p. 226.

Eun. well; as if T G were bound for

the Dr's pleaſure to give *ſuch reaſons*, as he would haue, and not what himſelf thought moſt *proper* for the preſent diſpute? Does not the Dr himſelf in that very place, honour *them* with the title of *the beſt learned of the Roman divines*, who confeſſ *that Sacrifice doth not naturally* or of it ſelf, *ſignify any worſhip of God, but by the Impoſition of men*? And do not thoſe other *Diuines* who maintain it to ſignify the *worſhip proper to God* upon the account of *nature*, acknowledge that it doth ſo alſo by the *common conſent of Mankind*? What neceſſity was there then, that T. G. in a debate with an Adverſary, whoſe *Genius* and *Cauſe* both lead him to multiply *Controverſies* without end, ſhould alledge any *other reaſon*, than *that* in which they all agree? whether *this conſent* of mankind, in uſing the *deſtruction* of creatures to ſignify the *ſupream dominion* of *God* ouer life and death, and *their Subjection* to him, owe it's Origine to *nature*, or to ſome *Inſpiration* or *command* of *God* given to men in the beginning, or were taken up by their own *Voluntary Election*, and ſo propagated to Poſterity, the Dr is at Def. 9. 216.

liberty to *diſpute* with the *Schoolmen*, or his own thoughts, as he pleaſes. It concerns not T. G. It was enough for him that he had the *conſent* of mankind on his ſide, that *Sacrifice* was to be offered to none but *God*.

Cathar. But do you remember what the Dr adds in that very place now cited by you? *How comes the deſtruction of any Creature*, ſaith he, *under our command to ſignify the inward ſubjection of our ſelves to God? What pleaſure can we conceive the Almighty ſhould take in ſeeing us to deſtroy his creatures for his ſake? Our minds may be as farr from ſubmitting to God, as theſe things are of themſelves from ſignifying ſuch a ſubmiſſion. Nay how comes a ſacrifice to ſtand ſo much in our ſtead, that becauſe we take away the life of that, therfore we own God as our Lord? It might rather of it ſelf ſignify that we haue the power of life and death over Beaſts, than that God hath it over us.* Def. p. 226.

Eun: I remember the *paſſage* very well; but I do not remember where T. G. ſaid that *the deſtruction of a creature* doth *of it ſelf* ſignify our *ſubjection* to *God*. What he ſaith is that *this materiall*

action may be done for ſeveral ends and Intentions; and is not the *Inſtitution* of *God*, or the *Impoſition* of *men* ſufficient to *determin* it, when uſed as an act of *worſhip*, to ſignify the *abſolute worſhip* due to *God*, but that it muſt be determin'd *of it ſelf*? Who ever heard any thing more *trifling* and *frivolous*? Is this to reaſon like a *Maſter* in *Iſrael*? Pray tell me, *Catharinus*; do you not think *Moſes* would haue been put *shrewdly* to it, had *Korah*, *Dathan*, and *Abiram*, inſtead of ſeeking the *Prieſthood*, quarrel'd at the *Sacrifices*, and made the *ſame demands* to him, which the Dr does to T. G.? For might they not haue ſaid to him (and ſurely *it would haue become Moſes his learning to haue informed them in this matter*,) *How comes the deſtruction of any creature under our command to ſignify the inward ſubjection of our ſelves to God? What pleaſure can we conceive the Almighty ſhould take in ſeeing us to deſtroy his creatures for his ſake? Our minds may be as farr from ſubmitting to God, as thoſe things are of themſelves from ſignifying ſuch a ſubmiſſion. Nay how comes a Sacrifice to ſtand ſo much in our ſtead, that becauſe*

Cath. de Idol. Pa. 182.

we take away the life of that; therefore we own God as our Lord? It might rather of it self signify that we have the power of life and death over Beasts, than that God hath it over us. But alas poor men, they were not acquainted with *these subtilties.* They took it upon the *Common consent* of all *Mankind*, that *sacrifice* was an External Act of *worship* due to *God alone*, and so quarrel'd not the *offering* it to him, as *Nonsensical*, but affected themselves to have a *share* in the honour and Office of the *Priesthood.*

P. 117. *Cathar. Be it so*, if you will of the *Jewish* sacrifices: *But*, (as the Dr goes on) *of all things in the world, it would never have come into my mind, nor I think into any man's well in his senses, to offer up* God *himself unto* God *as a Sacrifice, in order to the testifying the devoting of our selves unto him; and yet this, after all their talk, comes to be that external sacrifice, which is the only appropriate sign of the absolute worship of* God, *viz. the Sacrifice of the Mass, wherein the Priest is believed, to offer up* God *himself under the species of Bread and Wine to the Eternal God in token of our subjection*

to him. Me thinks yet it were some what more reasonable to offer up brute Creatures that are under us, than God that is so infinitely above us, and such is the weakness of my understanding, that this seems to be rather an Argument of our Power over God, than of our subjection to him. But since the Formal Reason of a sacrifice is said to lie in the destruction of it. Good Lord! What thoughts must these men have (if they have any) when they think it in their power, first to make their God by speaking five words, then to offer him up as a sacrifice, then to suppose him destroyed, and all this to testify their submission to God. I want words, saith he, to Express the intolerable Blasphemy and Absurdity of these things.

Eun: This I confess, is such a *passage* which I could not read without *horrour*, as being not only *trifling* and *Frivolous* as the former, but highly *Injurious* to that inestimable *Sacrifice*, which *Christ* himself offered upon the *Cross*. For what was it, the *Jews* were *scandaliz'd* at in it but *the offering of God to God. We preach*, saith *St Paul*, *Christ crucified, to the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Greeks Foolishness*. And then again Ch. 2. v. 7. 1. Cor. 1. 23.

We speak the Wisdome of God, which had the Princes of this world known they would not have crucified the LORD *of* GLORY. And could the Dr find no *Stone* to throw at the *Maſſ*, but *that* at which the *Jews ſtumbled*, and which his *wiſer Heathens* derided as *Foolishneſſ*? I wonder he was not afraid of that ſaying of the ſame *Apoſtle* 1. Cor. 1. 18, *The preaching of the Croſſ is to them that perish Foolishneſſ; but unto us which are ſaved, it is the Power of God*, when he durſt ſay, *Of all things in the world it cannot enter into my mind, nor I think into any man's well in his ſenſes to offer up God himſelf unto God as a Sacrifice?* For although he talk of the *making* and *deſtroying* of *God* in the *Maſſ*, yet he knows very well, there is no ſuch thing *done* or *believed* to be done there, but that the *ſame* Chriſt who is in Heauen is believed to be *whole* under either *Species*; and his *Bloud* to be *ſeparated* from his *Body* not really, but *Myſtically* only and in *Repreſentation*. But theſe *bugg words* were to be thruſt in to giue a *colour* to his *Exorbitancie*. The *main thing* he inſiſts upon is *the Intolerable Blaſphemy and Abſurdity*, as he calls it,

of offering up God himself unto God as a Sacrifice. But Good Lord! *What thoughts* must he haue (if he haue any) of the *Sacrifice* of the *Croſſ*? Can it enter into his mind, that *Chriſt* himſelf (with *Reuerence* be it ſpoken and *trembling* too) was *not well in his ſenſes*, when he offered up *God* himſelf to *God* as a *Sacrifice*? Or that thoſe who were at the foot of the *Croſſ*, might not haue offered *him* up to his *Father*, who voluntarily offered himſelf for them, *in order to the teſtifying the deuoting themſelues* as ſacrifices *to* (*him* if he ſhould pleaſe to require it,) without *loſing* their *ſenſes*? If not, why muſt thoſe be out of their *ſenſes*, who offer up the *ſame ſacrifice* to him, and with like deuotion upon the Altar? This is *ſuch* an *Argument* as might haue been expected from the Pen of a *Crellius*. But I will not ſuppoſe the Dr, either to deny with him that *Chriſt* was the High *God*, becauſe he was ſo kind to T. G. as to ſuppoſe *he would not deny the Creator and Gouernour of the world to be the true God*; or that Chriſt did not offer up *himſelf* to *God*, when St Paul ſaith ſo expreſsly, *that he gaue himſelf for us*, *as*

Def. p. 5.

Epheſ. 5. 2.

an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour, and there he who is
Hebr. 1. 3. *the Brightnesse of his Fathers Glory, purged our sins by himself.* Or that he thinks it as much for the *honour* of God and the *good* of our *souls* to offer the bloud of *brute Creatures*, viz, *of Bulls and of*
Hebr. 9. 14. *Goats*, as *the Bloud of Christ who offered himself without spot to God*. These things I leave, yet withall I cannot omit to tell you, that I see another *ground* from whence this kind of *transport* may proceed, and at what it *levelt*.

Cathar. Pray let me know what it is.

Eun: It is that he cannot with any patience *endure* to hear of the *Sacrifice of the Altar*, though he be content to *bow* to it. *That* must down, though the *Sacrifice* of the *Crosse* fall with it. And
Cath. no. Idol. p. 391. this was it, which when T. G. had said, that *that Religion* (speaking only in general) *which admits no external Visible sacrifice, must needs be deficient in the most signal part of the Publick worship of God*, made him so *sollicitous* and eager to repell the very suspition of having
Def. p. 226. any such sacrifice from the *Church* of *England*. *What External Visible sacrifice have you*, saith he (speaking to those

of the *Church* of *Rome*) *that we haue not, besides that of God himself, whom you believe to be personally present* (as if the *Church* of *England* did not) *as the Object of divine worship under the species of Bread and Wine?* But was this to speak like a *Champion* of the *Church* of *England*? How farr he *dissents* herein from the *sentiments* of the *true* and *genuin Sons* of *this* Church, that is (according to his own Paraphrase in his General Preface) *the most remote from all suspition of dis-affection to her, or Inclination to Puritanism*, may easily appear from what that Person of *great learning and Excellent Piety, Mr. Thorndike*, (as the Dr himself acknowledges him to haue been), hath delivered upon *this* subject. Hauing maintained, saith he, that the *Elements* are *really* changed from Ordinary Bread and Wine, into the *Body* and *Bloud* of *Christ*, mystically present as in a *Sacrament*, and *that* in vertue of the *Consecration*, not by the *Faith* of him that receives; I am to admit and maintain, Whatsoever appears *duly consequent* to this Truth; namely, that the *Elements so consecrated* are truly the *sacrifice* of *Christ* upon the *Cross*, in

Mr Thorndike Epil l. 3. c. 5. p. 44.

as much as the *Body* an *Bloud* of *Christ* are conrained in them. And then farther addes (p. 46.) that the *sacrifice* of the *Cross* being necessarily *Propitiatory* and *Impetratory* both, it cannot be denied, that the *sacrament* of the *Eucharist* inasmuch as it is *the same sacrifice* of *Christ* upon the *Cross*, -- is also both *Propitiatory* and *Impetratory*. The same is asserted by Dr *Heylyn* in his *Necessary Introduction* to *Cyprianus Anglicus*. Assuredly, saith he, if the *Priest* and *Altar* be so near, the *Lamb* for the *Burnt-offering* cannot be farr of, even the most Blessed *Lamb of God*, which takes away the sins of the world, (as the Scripture styles him) whose *Passion* we find commemorated in the *sacrament*, called therefore the *sacrament of the Altar*; and for the same reason called by *S. Augustin* in his Enchiridion *Sacrificium Altaris*, the *Sacrifice* of the *Altar*; by the *English Liturgie* in the Prayer next after the Participation, *the Sacrifice of Praise and Thankes-giving* (Sacrificium laudis;) By *Chrysostom*, *The remembrance of a Sacrifice*, and by many learned Writers among our selves, *a Commemorative Sacrifice*. For thus saith

Dr. Heylyn. Introduct. n: 14.

Bp Andrews in his Answer to Card. Bellarmin, c. 8. *Tollite de Missa Transubstantiationem vestram, nec diu nobiscum lis erit de sacrificio.* Which the said Dr *Heylyn* translates in this manner, *Take from the Mass your Transubstantiation, and we will haue no difference with you about the sacrifice*: declaring thereby how *consequent* he thought the admitting of a *Sacrifice* to be, to the belief of the *Real Presence* of the Body and Bloud of *Christ* in the Sacrament, which he there shows to haue been the *constant doctrine* of the *Church* of *England*, both from her *Liturgie* and *Catechism*, and the writings of *the best learned of her divines*; among whom he cites that Profession of *Bp Andrews* in the name of the *Church* of *England* to Card. *Bellarmin*. Præsentiam credimus non minus quam vos veram; de modo præsentiæ nil temerè definimus. *We acknowledge a presence as true and Real as you do: but we determine nothing rashly of the manner of it.* From which and the Testimonies of some other divines he saith, *It seems it is agreed on both sides* (that is to say, the *Church* of *England* and the *Church* of *Rome*) that there is-

Bp Andrews. Resp. ad Apol. Bell.

n. 25, 26

true and *Real Presence* of *Christ* in the Holy Eucharist, the *disagreement* being only in the *modus Præsentiæ*, the *manner* of the Presence.

This is what the *true* and *genuin sons* of the *Church* of *England* teach both concerning the *Real Presence*, and the *Sacrifice* of *Christ's Body* and *Blood* in the *Sacrament* of the *Altar*, as well knowing how great a *defect* it would be for a *Church* to want the most *signal* Part of the Publick *worship* of God as that of *Sacrifice* is 1st They assert the *Person* of *Christ* to be as *truly* and *Really* present there, as those of the *Church* of *Rome* do. 2. They assert *it* also to be there, *as the Object of divine worship*; for Mr *Thorndike* speaking of the *Adoration* of *Christ* in the *Eucharist*, saith, *I do believe that it was so practised, and done in the Ancient Church, which I maintain from the beginning to have been the true Church of Christ.* And Bp *Andrews* tells Cardinal *Bellarmin* very plainly, that *the King* (King *James*, and *did not he understand what he said, and what they* of the Church of England *did?*) *holds Christ to be truly present in the sacrament, and there also to be truly*

Epil. P. 2. P. 51

Resp. ad Apol. Bellar. c. 8.

Rex Christum in Eucharistia vere præsentem

adorable. Laſtly they aſſert the *Euchariſt* to be not only a *Sacrament*, but a *Sacrifice*, and the very *Same ſacrifice* of *Chriſt* upon the *Croſs*. How comes the Dr then to *contradict* all theſe Points when he ſaid ſpeaking to thoſe of the Church of Rome, *What external Viſible ſacrifice have you the twe have not, beſides God himſelf, whom you believe to be perſonally preſent, as the Object of divine Worship, under the ſpecies of Bread and Wine?* Was it to ſhow his excellent skill in the affairs and doctrine of the *Church* he pretends to defend? No, he could not be ignorant of ſo evident a matter. The very names of *Prieſt* and *Altar* put him daily in mind of it. What made him then tell thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome* that the *Church* of *England* hath no ſuch *Sacrifice*, as that of *Chriſt* perſonally *preſent* in the *Sacrament*, as the *Object* of *divine worſhip*? O, it was the *Intolerable Blaſphemy and Abſurdity*, as he calls it, *of offering up God himſelf as a ſacrifice to God. For of all things in the world, it could never have come into his mind, nor he thinks into any man's well in his ſenſes* (by which it ſeems he thinks Bp

verè & adorandum Euchariſt.

Def. p. 282.

Andrews, Dr *Heylin*, Mr *Thorndike*, and the reſt to have been craz'd at leaſt) *to offer up God himſelf unto God as a ſacrifice in order to the teſtifying our devoting our ſelves to him.* But if this be *Blaſphemy*, and the Drs *definition* muſt obtain againſt *that* of the two General *Councils* of *Nice* and *Epheſus*. I know no way but to renounce my *Creed*. For I do not ſee, but it is *alike blaſphemous*, to ſay, that *God was born of the Virgin Mary, ſuffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried*, as that he offered *himſelf* upon the *Croſs*, or is *offered* by us upon the *Altar*. And now hath not the *Church* of *England* great reaſon to glory in ſuch a *Champion*, who under a ſpecious pretence of impugning the *Maſſ*, fears not to traduce the moſt excellent part of her *Religious worſhip* (as it is underſtood by the *beſt Learned* of her *divines*) as *blaſphemous* and *abſurd*, and ſo wound both *her*, and the *Common Chriſtianity* to the very heart, through the *ſides* of her Enemies?

Eubar. Let the Dr and the *Church* of *England* agree about theſe things as They can. I do not ſee after all their fine talk of the *nature* and *dignity* of their

ſacrifice

ſacrifice of the *Maſſ*, as due only to God; but that themſe ves in their practice offer it to *Creatures* alſo. For as the Dr hath well obſerved out of their own *Maſſ-books*, they *offer it in honour of the Saints*: and although they pretend they do it to God in *thanksgiving* for the Graces he hath beſtowed upon the *Saints*, yet Dr St deſires to know of them, *whether this be not more than giving God thanks for their vertues; when a Propitiatory ſacrifice is offered up to God for their honour*: moreover *at the ſame time they pray, that the Saints would intercede with God for them. And What is joyning creatures together with God in the honour of ſacrifice, if this be not?* Again ſuppoſing that they offer it only to God, yet as *Cajetan* obſerves, *it cannot reach to all Chriſtians, but only belongs to the Prieſts to offer it. And ſo they reſerve no one act of External Adoration as proper to God, and to be performed by all Chriſtians.*

Def. p. 218.

p. 219.

p. 220.

Def. p. 205.

Eun: To what *miſerable ſhifts* are men put, when they would haue ſuch *Trivial* kind of arguing as this to paſſ for *ſolid* Reaſoning. Either the Dr was *nettled* without cauſe for T. G's. telling

him upon occaſion, that he would underſtand *better* what belongs to a *ſacrifice*, when he was become a *Proſelyte*, Or it muſt be a hard world, when a man of his abilities muſt be forc'd to *fain* that he doth not know how the ſame *ſacrifice* may be a *Propitiation* for ſins, and a *Thank-giving* for Benefits: eſpecially the *Sacrifice* of the *Altar*, being the *ſame* with that of the *Croſſ*, in which all the *differences* of the legal *ſacrifices* were fulfilled. I cannot conceive but that in his frequent Reſearches into *Bellarmin* he muſt haue met with that famous paſſage of *S. Auguſtin*, where he ſaith, *that when the ſacrifice of the (Altar*, which he there cals the *ſacrifice of the Mediator,) is offered in the Church for all the faithfull departed, it is to ſuch as were good, but not perfectly good, a ſacrifice of Propitiation*: but *for the perfectly good, of Thanksgiving*. And I thought T. G. had given him a very home-Example how this might be for the honour of a Perſon, when he deſired him to reflect, *whether it would not be for his honour, that his whole Party ſhould keep a ſolemn Day of Thanksgiving for his great performances*

lib. 1. de Purg. c. 18. *Enchirid c. 110.*

Cath. no. Idol. p. 394.

againſt the Papiſh Cauſe, although the Thanks were given to God and not to him. And indeed it was ſo *home* that he doth *not deny* it would haue been *for his honour.* But then *to return*, as he ſaith, *the kindneſſ of T. G's twitch by a forrain* example fetch'd from *Perſia*, *where Proſtration was appropriated to their King, as a ſign of ſubjection to him alone, how ſtrange*, ſaith he, *would is haue been thought among them, for a man to haue ſaid to the King, I fall down before you in honour of the Captain of your Guards?* A very notable example I can aſſure you. Yet there is this *difference*, that how *ſtrange* ſoever it might haue appeared among the *Perſians* to hear this ſaid to their *King*, (as it doth now to Countrey People to hear one ſay, *I kiſs your hands*, inſtead of *I thank you*,) it ſeems it is *not ſo* among *thoſe* of the *Church* of *Rome* to ſay to *God. We offer this ſacrifice to thee in the honour of St Michael*, to teſtify their *application* of it in *thankſgiving* for the *favours* and *Graces* beſtowed on him; and why *they* may not uſe *other* manners of *expreſſion*, as well as of *habits* or *geſtures* from thoſe of the *Perſians*, I do not undeſtand: p. 221.

and as litle why *they* ought not to be *underſtood*, *as* they *declare* themſelves to *mean*, the *Will* of men being the *Miſtreſſ*, and *Cuſtome* the *Confirmer* of ſuch forms of ſpeaking. But ſtill *the Queſtion is*, ſaith the Dr, *if ſacrifice be appropriated to the ſole honour* of *God, how the honour of Saints comes to be declared by it*? But granting, as he doth, that it *is for the honour of a Perſon to praiſe* (or give thanks to) *God for him*, this I ſay being granted, the *Queſtion* as I take it can be no other than to ask, whether the *offering* of a *Preſent*, (as *ſacrifice* is) in token of *Gratitude*, be to *diminiſh* or *adde* to the Act of *Thankſgiving*? For if it be a *greater Declaration* of *Thankſgiving*, it muſt conſequently be a *greater Declaration* alſo of the *honour* of the Perſon for whom it is offered. O but at *the ſame time* that they offer the *ſacrifice* in honour of the *Saints*, *they pray that they would intercede with God for them*. This is more than the Dr finds in their *Maſſ-books*, at leaſt from the *Offertory*, where the *Prieſt* begins to apply himſelf to the *Action* of *ſacrifice*: for from thence forward the *Prayers* are all directed to *God*. But in caſe they did

ſo, would it therefore follow that the *ſacrifice* is offered to the *Saints* becauſe they are deſired to *join* their Prayers with the People to obtain the bleſſings they ask of *God*? *This* ſurely is ſomething beyond *Trifling*, for the Dr might as well haue ſaid that the *ſacrifice* is *offered* to the *People* becauſe the *Prieſt* after the *Offertory* turns to them, with, *Orate fratres*, and deſires them to *Pray* that it may become *acceptable* to *God*; and if you haue nothing of more moment to propoſe, I think it is high time we make an *End* indeed.

Cathar. But you haue *forgot* to ſpeak to what I propoſed in the laſt place; that *ſuppoſing* they offer it only to *God*, yet this, as *Cajetan* obſerves, *cannot reach to all Chriſtians, but only belongs to the Prieſts to offer it*; and ſo they *reſerue no one external act of Adoration as proper to God, and to be performed by all Chriſtians.* In 1. 2. q. 86. art. 4.

Enn. You did well to *call* upon me, Otherwiſe I confeſs I had paſs'd *this* over, as a thing not *worthy* the taking-notice of; for there is nothing more notorious than that *thoſe* of the *Church* of *Rome* are *bound* on every *Sunday* and

Holy-day to *hear Masse* (as they cal it) by that *External Act* to testify the uniting their *Intention* with the *Priest* as the Publick *Officer* of the *Church* in the *Oblation* of the *Sacrifice*. And what is it the Dr would haue *more*? Would he haue the *City* of *London* when they make a *Present* to the *King* at his *Coronation* in order to the testifying their *subjection* to him, to go *every* one in Perso, and deliver it with his *own* hands? Is it not enough that some *Publick Person* be deputed, as the *Lord Maior*, or the *Recorder* to do it in their *names*, and the *King* accepts it as *offered* by each one? If this be so in *things* belonging to *men*, how much more in *those* belonging to *God*, where as *St Paul*, saith: *Every High-Priest taken from amõg men is ordained for men, that they may offer both Gifts and sacrifices for sins, and that both for himself and for the People*? And if *this* did not hinder in the *old Law*, but that both *Princes* and *People* are said to haue *offered those sacrifices to the Lord*, why must it in the *new*? I do not except against the Dr's Citation out of *Cajetan*, though I do not find it in the place quoted by him. But this I dare affirm, that *Cajetan* was

Heb. 5. v. 3.

not ſo ſilly a *divine* as to deny it belonged to the *People* to offer the *Sacrifice by* and *with* the *Prieſt*; but that it belõgs not to them to *Conſecrate* it, any more than it did in the *old Law* to *kill* and lay it upon the *Altar*. The very *Maſſ-Book* it ſelf would haue informed him better, in which the *Prieſt* calls it *their* ſacrifice as well as his, *Meum ac Veſtrum ſacrificium*, and deſires of God to accept it for all thoſe, *pro quibus tibi offerimus, vel qui tibi offerunt hoc ſacrificium.* For whom *we*, ſaith he, *offer*, *or who offer this ſacrifice to thee.* And I can imagin but *two reaſons*, why *this* ſhould not hold as well in the *new Law*, as the *Old*; The Firſt given by *Korah* and his Complices, when they told *Moſes* and *Aaron*, *Yee take too much upon you, ſeing all the Congregation are holy, every one of them, and the Lord is among them, where fore then lift yee up your ſelves aboue the Congregation of the Lord?* Which was no other that to teach the *People* to *invade* the Prieſthood; Or 2^ly that there is no *ſacrifice offered* in the *new Law*, and this *contradicts* not only the *Practice* of the *Church* of *Chriſt* in the *Primitive* times, but the *ſenſe* alſo of the *beſt* Num. 16. 3.

learned divines of the *Church* of *England*. But it is not in *this Point* alone, that the Dr doth it, but in *many* others, as I haue shown in the fore going *Conferences*, which if you think fit to *Communicate* to him, I conceive you will do well at the same time to *aduise* him as a *Friend*, both for his *own* credit, and *that* of the *Church* he pretends to defend, to take in good part the *Counsel* which *St Augustin* gives to some *Endless*, because *wordish* disputers of his time. *Let him consider all things diligently, and if perhaps iudging impartially he perceive them to be such, as may rather be play'd upon* and made seemingly ridiculous or blasphemous *by a Satyrical or Mimical kind of Levity, than solidly confuted, let him surcease to trifle, and chuse rather to be amended and reformed by the. Wise than to be extol'd, and applauded by those who are otherwise.*

Lib. 5. de Civ. Dei c. ult.

Considerent omnia diligenter, & si forte sine studio partium judicantes talia esse perspexerint, quæ potius exagitari, quam convelli possint,.. quasi Satyrica vel Mimica levitate, cohibeant suas nugas, & potius à prudentibus emendari, quàm laudari ab imprudentibus eligant.

Cathar. But do you hope then, *Eunomius*, that Dr St will ever become a true *Church-of-England-Man*, in the *sense* you understand it? that he will retract

retract his charge of *Idolatry*, and acquit at least the *doctrine* of the *Church* of *Rome* from the *Guilt* of it in the *worship* of *Images*, the *Invocation* of *Saints*, and *Adoration* of the *Host*? That he will ever *swallow* the *Contradictions* of *Christs Personal Presence in the Sacrament*? nay first *adore* him, then *offer him* believing him to be *God in sacrifice*, and after all *eat him*? When this comes to pass, I think the *Papists* will have litle or no reason to *despair* of his coming over and *joyning* with them.

Eun. How *jestingly* soever you say this, *Catharinus*, yet I think in *good Earnest* I may tell you that the very *Principles* he admits, if *followed* home, would *lead* him *thither*? For *granting*, as he doth, 1st. that the *Church* of *Rome* is a *true Church*, and doth not *erre* against any *Fundamental Point* of *Faith*; 2dly that the *Gates* of *Hell* have not prevailed against the *whole Christian Church*; and 3dly that a *Christian by vertue of his being so is bound to join in Communion with some Church or Congregation of Christians*: I do not see, but he is bound either to assign some *other true Church* of *Christ* in the world before

Luther beſides that of *Rome*, or elſe by vertue of his *Chriſtianity* he is bound to joyn in *Communion* with it.

Cathar. Yet ſtill the Dr hath this *refuge* left him, why we ought not to joyn with the *Roman*, becauſe *if ſhe be guilty of Idolatry, our Communion with her would be a ſin.*

See Dialog. 3. 4. 5. of the Firſt Part.

Eun. As for the *Charge* of *Idolatry*, I hope you haue been made *ſenſible*, how *un-maintainable* it is, both from the *ſtrange Conſequences* that follow from it, even to the *ſubverſion* of all *lawful Eccleſiaſtical Authority* in the *Church* of *England*: as alſo from the *Extravagant Ways* the Dr is forced to make uſe of at any rate to uphold it, as *Apologizing* for the *Heathens*, aſſerting *their Jupiter* to be the *true God*, *miſ-repreſenting* and *corrupting* Authors, denying the *Perſonal Preſence* of *Chriſt* in the *Sacrament*, and *contradicting* not only the true and Genuin Sons of the *Church* of *England*, but moſt of all *himſelf*. This therefore can be no *good ground* to maintain the *Separation*.

Cathar. What then can, I pray?

Eun. That's a *Point* which requires *more time* than I haue at preſent to *ſpend*

upon it. To *morrow* morning I begin my *Iourney* without fail.

Cathar. I wish you *a good one*; and begg your pardon for hauing *detained* you so long.

FINIS.

A

POSTSCRIPT

FROM

THE PUBLISHER

A *Friend*, to whom I had given this *Treatise* to peruse, whilst the *Printer* was setting the following *Table*, having taken notice that the *Author* had not particularly replied to the *Parallel* which the Dr draws from the *Practice* of the *Modern Heathens* in the *East* and *West Indies*, as to the *worship* they give to their *Inferiour deities* and *Images*, with *that* of the *Church* of *Rome*, and the *Printer* informing me there would be two or three leaves left *Vacant* in the last sheet, I thought it not amiss to acquaint the Reader with the *Reasons* why the *Author* thought it not *necessary*: which were these.

1. Because the Dr himself reduces the *worship* of these *Heathens*, to one of these *two Principles*, viz *that* of the *Platonists*, *that God hath committed the*

Def. p. 113.

Government of the world under him to some Inferiour deities; Or *that* of *Varro* and the *Stoicks*, *that God is the soul of the world, and therefore the Parts of it deserve divine honour*: And the *Author* having shown the *Stoicks* to be guilty of true *Internal Idolatry* for worshipping a *Creature* instead of the *Creator*; and the *Platonists*, at least of the *Exteriour Profession* of it, for coucurring with the *Vulgar* in the *External Practice* of their *Idolatry*, it would haue been but *actum agere* to repeat the same things over again. Supra. p. 349. Part. 3. Dial. 5.

2. Because the force of the *Parallel* lyes altogether in *Citations*; and the Dr had already forfeited all right to be beleived in things of *that kind*, by his notorious mis-representing and corrupting the *Fathers*. Nor can it with reason be presumed he would treat these *modern* Relators with more sincerity, than he had done those Venerable Persons: Or that he would be more *Exact* in citing any of *them*, than of *Trigantius*, by reason of what had been *objected* to him formerly by T. G. upon account of *that Author*; which it seems he laid up so carefully in his Memory, that having a Part. 2. Dial. 4. Part. 3. Dial. 3.

good Occasion as he thought of citing a passage out of him relating to a certain Sect of the Chinezes, which he delivers in these words, *Certum Triadis modum inducit, quo tres Deos in unum deinde Numen coalescere fabulatur*; by which, speaking of the *dogmata* or *Tenents*, as he there doth, of *that Sect*, one would think were meant some *Fabulous Story they had devised (in resemblance of the Trinity) of three distinct Gods, who afterwards grew into one Deity*, Dr St translates the words in this manner. *Certum Triadis modum inducit, They worship the Trinity after a certain manner, quo tres Deos in unum deinde Numen coalescere fabulatur, with an Image having Three Heads and one Body.* And then *desires T. G. once more to make use of his Friends kindness for Trigautius, that he may see whether he have translated him right, or no.* Now although an Ordinary Reader perhaps will find here neither *head* nor *foot*, Yet because the Dr assures us that the *Translation* is *exact*, the Author saith he is contented to let it passe for *such*: but not so *another passage* which the Dr. cites some leaves after out of the same

Def. Christ. Exped. apud Sinas. l. 1. c. 10.

Def. p. 130.

Trigautius. For whereas *Trigautius* after he had described the *Veneration* which the *Learned Chineses give to Confutius, the Author of their Sect, by bowing, wax-candles and Incense, in token of Gratitude for the learning found in his Books*, he farther addes speaking of the *same Sect, that they have likewise Temples to Tutelar Spirits for every City and Tribunal, where the Magistrates take their solemn oath to do Justice; and that they make Oblations to them also, and burn perfumes, but not with the same kind of worship which they give to their Master Confutius, for they acknowledge*, saith he, *a certain divine Power to be in these spirits, to punish perjur'd Persons, and to reward the upright*. His words are these. *Alia quoque ejusdem Sectæ Fana visuntur Tutelaribus spiritibus Vrbium singularum & Tribunalis cuique Magistratui propria. In eo Sacramento se solemni astringunt ad jus fasque seruandum. ---- His etiam Fercula offerunt & odores incendunt, sed non eodem quo supra cultu; nam in his agnoscunt perjuros plectendi proboſque remunerandi Divinam quandam ineſſe facultatem*. By which it appears, that what-

De Christ. Exped. apud Sinas l. 1. c. 10.

tever *resemblance* may be conceived in the *manner* of the *worship* they gave to *Confutius*, as there expreſſed, with *that* uſed towards *Saints* in the *Church* of *Rome*, yet *that* which they give to theſe *Tutelar Spirits* is shown by *Trigautius* to be plainly different from it, both from the *belief* they haue of *a Divine Power reſiding in thoſe Spirits*, and the *Religious Ceremony* of the Magiſtrates taking their *ſolemn Oath* before them, as having *power* to *reward* and *punish* them. Now what does Dr St. do that he may *ſet up* a *Parallel*, not only between the *worship* they gave to *Confutius* but between *this* alſo they give to the *Tutelar Spirits*, and *that* given in the *Church* of *Rome* to *Saints* and *Angels*? He tranſlates the words of *Trigautius* in this manner. *They haue likewiſe Temples*, ſaith he, *to Tutelar Spirits for every City and Tribunal, where they make Oblations, and burn Perfumes, acknowledging theſe to haue power to reward and punish.* Where. 1. he *omits* the *Ceremony* of the Magiſtrates taking their *ſolemn Oath* to or before theſe *Tutelar Spirits*, as thoſe who had *power* to reward or punish them. Then

again he *leaves* out what *Trigautius* expreſsly affirms, viz that the *worship* they gave to theſe ſpirits is *not* the *ſame* they give to *Confutius*: and laſtly he *ſlides over* the words *Nam* and *Divinã*, which import the *reaſon* of this Aſſertion to be, becauſe they believed the *Power* that was in them to be *divine*. And now if this be the Dr's way of drawing *Parallels* from the *Relations* of *Authors*, to ſuppreſs the *Emphatical words* that show the *difference*, the Reader will eaſily judge, it is no *very good one*; and withall how litle reaſon there was to ſpend a month or two's time in ſeeking and examining his *other Teſtimonies*, when he deals in this manner with *Trigautius*, whom for his former *ill ſucceſs* in citing him, and the *reparation* of his *credit*, he ought to haue treated with *more Caution* and *exactneſs* than the *reſt*.

A *third* Reaſon is, becauſe although the *Wiſer ſort* of theſe *Modern Heathens* make uſe, when they are preſs'd, of the *ſame Artifices* and *Pretences*, which the *old ones* did in the time of the *Fathers*, to elude the Arguments of the *Chriſtians*, yet it appears from *many* of the *Citations* alledged by the Dr himſelf

(and you may be ſure he would *mince* the matter on that ſide as much as he could) that *they* themſelves, or at leaſt the *Generality*, either worſhipped a *Falſe God* for the *true one*, as *thoſe* who held *God to be the Soul of the world, or to have produced all things out of his own ſubſtance ſo that the world and all* the things in it, are *but one and the ſelf ſame thing which is God himſelf*? or that they worſhipped *Falſe Gods* together with the *true one*, if they worſhipt *him* at all, as may be ſeen by what the particular *Relations* cited by the Dr report of the *Chineſes*, p. 129. of the *Tartars*, p. 140. Of the *Peruans*, p. 145. 148. Of the *Mexicans*, p. 151. Of the *Negros* of *Africa*, p. 152. Of the *Indians* of *Narſinga* &c. p. 154. 155. Of the *Northern Nations*, p. 158 159. Of the *Laplanders*, and *Inhabitants* of *Samogitia*, p. 160. 161.

Def. p. 224.

4. Laſtly, becauſe ſpeaking *abſtractedly* and in general, as the *Author* argued formerly concerning the *worſhip* which the *ancient Heathens* gave to their *Inferiour Deitie* and *Images*, ſo here again, it may be ſaid of the *worſhip* which the *Modern Heathens* give

Supra p. 115.

to *theirs*; that either it is the *same* which thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome* give to *Saints* and *Images*, or *not*. If it be *not* the *ſame* (as it appears by the *Relation* of *Trigantius* had he been *truely* cited, and of many Others, as they ſtand cited by the Dr himſelf, it is *not*) the *Parallel* is loſt. If it be the *ſame*, that is, if any of them give *no more* but an *Inferiour reſpect* and *Veneration* ſuch as is due upon the account of *Vertue* and *Sanctity* without any mixture of *Divine honour*, or what may rationally be underſtood to be *ſuch*, (though it be *unlawfull* to give it to a *falſe Object*) yet the *manner* of the worship, which is what the Dr. charges with *Idolatry*, though given to the *B. Virgin* herſelf, whoſe *Sanctity* I ſuppoſe he will not queſtion, is *excuſed* from the note of it by *Eminent Divines* of the *Church* of *England*. And I cannot but wonder, how the Dr could ever *hope*, that his *own bare Relation* of a *Decree* made at *Rome*, againſt the uſing external acts in themſelves unlawfull and ſuperſtitious to or before the *Altar* of an *Idol* or *Falſe Saint*, though the Intention were *directed* to a *Crucifix* hidden upon it (of which

See his Def. p. 129. 144. 146. 149. &c.

Supra p. 33. 34.

decree he ſets down the *Reſolutions* of the 7.th 8.th & 9.th *Queres* to be *nullatenus licere* &c. without telling us in particular what the *Queres* were.) I ſay it is a wonder to me, how he could hope that ſuch a *Relation* as this, ſhould yet be of ſufficient credit to make any man of *common ſenſe* believe, that the *Cardinals de propaganda Fide*, (not with the half only, but *with the full conſent of the Pope*) had *condemned* the giving *external acts of worſhip* to *Saints* and *Images* as *Idolatrous*, or that when they gave *theſe Reſolutions*, they had nothing repreſented to them in the *practice* of the *converted Mandarins* of *China*, which might make *their* worſhip *unlawfull*, *different* from what themſelves *practiced* every day at Rome; eſpecially when the Dr himſelf confeſſes, *that the Congregation calls the Image of the Tutelar Spirit an Idol*, and tells us farther out of *Semedo* in his Hiſt: of *China* ch. 18. that *they have Temples for* Heaven *and* Earth *in* Nankin *and* Pekim, *in which the King himſelf offers the* Sacrifice; *And in the Cities they have Temples for* Tutelar Spirits, *to which the* Mandarins *do* ſacrifice, *as to the Spi-*

Def. p. 314. p. 129.

rits of the Rivers, Mountains, and four Parts of the world, &c.

When the *Impartial Reader* hath duly weigh'd and consider'd these things I suppose he will find there is *enough* said of this matter: and I may take my leave for the present.

THE ARGUMENTS OF THE DIALOGUES.

THE FIRST PART.

The First Dialogue.

EVronius declares his dis-satisfaction with the Charge of Idolatry, and Dr Stillingfleet's pretending it to be the Sense of the Church of England. The Dr's Endeavours in that part shown to be Insufficient, particularly as to the Book of Homilies, and the Rubrick for kneeling at Communion. The sad account of History we are like to have from him, when he denies Robert Abbot Bishop of Salisbury to have been never till now suspected for a Puritan. His charge of Idolatry different from that of the true and Genuin Sons of

the Church of England; divers of whom vindicate the Doctrine of the Second Council of Nice concerning the worship of Images, from the note of Idolatry. The true State of the Controversy concerning that Point. pag. 1.

The Second Dialogue.

A Farther Declaration of the Sense of the Church of England concerning the Charge of Idolatry, in answer to what Dr. St. urges from the Testimony of Arch Bishop Whitgift, and the 39. Articles. The Lambeth Articles suppressed by Q. Eliz. And rejected by K. James: The Dr. desired to reconcile the doctrine of his Irenicum, viz, that nothing is lawfull in the worship of God but what he hath expressly commanded; with that in his Answer to N. O. that All things are lawfull which are not forbidden. The true meaning of the 22th. Article concerning the worshipping and Adoration of Images asserted. pag. 39.

The Third Dialogue.

Several important Consequences, urged by T. G. as following from the charge of Idolatry, which the Dr. passes by in silence. His obligation either to deny, or assign a distinct Church in all Ages, pre-

XUM

ſerved from Hereſy and Idolatry, with which Chriſtians were bound to joyn in Communion. T. G's Arguments to ſhew the Roman Church to be that Church, not anſwered by the Dr, nor the Queſtion propoſed by T. G. concerning the neceſſity of joyning with the Church of England. His Irenicall Doctrine, Of the lawfulneſs of Non-Communion with any Church, that impoſeth doubtfull or ſuſpected Practices. The charge of Idolatry not maintainable upon the Dr's Principles without groſſe ſelf-contradiction. pag. 64.

The Fourth Dialogue.

Mr. Thorndike's Judgment of the Charge of Idolatry, with Dr. St's. Honourable Encomium of him. In ſtead of juſtifying the Separation he brings the Guilt of the Schiſm upon himſelf and the Church of England. A further diſplay of his Omiſſions and Contradictions. His Parallel between the worſhip of the Heathens, and that of the Church of Rome ſhown to be Impertinent, and the Worſhip of God by an Image not to be expreſsly prohibited in the 2d Commandment. pag. 98

The Fifth Dialogue.

The Charge of Idolatry not maintainable

ainable without ſubverting all lawfull Eccleſiaſtical Authority in the Church of England. Dr St's Doctrine in his Anſwer to N. O, concerning the Power and Authority of the Church; He is left at liberty to chuſe whether he will have it be a Retractation or Contradiction of what he aſſerted in his Irenicum, ſet down in the 3d Dialogue. His miſtake of the Validity of Ordination for the lawfull Authority to Exerciſe the Power conferred by it, ſhown to be Inexcuſable. A Recapitulation of what hath been diſcourſed in this, and the fore-going Dialogues. p. 131

THE SECOND PART.

The Firſt Dialogue.

A *Diſcovery of the Vanity of Dr. St's Endleſs diſcourſes in his late* Defence, *in Relation to T. G. His Excellent Gloſſ of the Canon of the Church of England, concerning Bowing to the Altar; which* the Author of a late Treatiſe, entituled Patronus Bonæ Fidei, *by Arguments caſt in the Dr's own moulds, contends to be Idolatry, worſe than that of the Romaniſts, or Ægyptians.* p. 167.

XUM

The Second Dialogue.

What Dr S. ought to have done to maintain his Charge. The first thing was to have laid down the true Notion of Idolatry in the Nature of the thing, antecedently to any Positive Prohibition. The Notion he gives of it shown to be insufficient; and the Heathens not justly chargeable with Idolatry by vertue of it. The Consequence he urges from the worship of Images to a like worship of all other beings declared useless: and a Specimen given of his rare Insight in Mystical Theology pag. 192

The Third Dialogue.

The Second Thing Dr S. ought to have done, to maintain his Charge of Idolatry, in the worship of Images, was to shew the doctrine of the Church of Rome in her Councils to be Idolatrous. The doctrine of the Second Council of Nice in that Point, as stated by himself, not Idolatrous; and the Practice of bowing to the Altar, according to his Principles, flat Idolatry. An Instance of his reporting faithfully the Authorities he alledges, laid open in a passage cited by him out of Cardinal Lugo. p. 212

The Fourth Dialogue.

Another Instance of Dr Sts reporting faithfully, shown in a passage he cites out of S. Gregory Nyssen in the case of the Arians. The doctrine of the same S. Gregory concerning an Inferiour Respect due to the Saints, and their Reliques. The Argument the Dr. brings from the practice of the Arians, shown to be Incongruous, and manifestly different from that of Roman-Catholiks towards Saints and Images. His Excellent Defence of a Testimony out of Arnobius formerly misrepresented by him, and Subtil Observations upon the doctrine of the Council of Trent in the matter of Images. The Remedies devised by him for avoiding Idolatry in the worship of Images, equally applicable to bowing to the Altar, or the Chair of State. p. 233

THE THIRD PART.

The First Dialogue.

THe Notion of the Heathen's Idolatry imposed on T. G. by Dr. Sts refuted from the Places out of which it was pretended to be gathered. The Grand

Question brought to try all, viz. whether the Heathen's Jupiter were according to the Fathers, the true God, or a Devil? The former asserted by Dr. St, the latter by T. G. and proved by plain and undeniable Testimonies of more than a whole Jury of Fathers besides Origen. The Dr's mighty Argument from the Inscription to the Unknown God, shown to be not only Impertinent, but against himself. p. 275

The Second Dialogue.

The greatest part of the Testimonies of the Fathers produced by Dr. St, that is, all those which import no more, than either that the Heathens had a natural knowledge of one Supream God, or that it was their Sense that their Jupiter was He, shown to be Impertinent to the Dispute between him and T. G. from the true State of the Question. His injurious usage of the Fathers, blaming them for charging the Heathens with more than they were guilty of, or themselves could prove, (being indeed a tacite Confession that he look'd upon them as Opposit to him) laid open in a cleer account of the Heathen's Theology, and the several ways the Fathers took to refute it, all of

them convincing, as is made manifest both from the arguments themselves being rightly applied to their due subjects, and the success they had. pag. 307

The Third Dialogue.

The Particular Testimonies of Minucius Felix, Clemens Alexandrinus, S. Augustin, and Tertullian, *cited by Dr. St. to prove it to have been* their Sense, *that the Heathen's Jupiter was the true God, brought to the Test; And the design of the said Fathers shown to be either* mis-represented, *or both their Words and Sense* corrupted *by him.* p. 352

The Fourth Dialogue.

Catharinus *waves the Question of* Jupiter's *being the* true God: *and inforces the Parallel from the* Heathen's *acknowledgment of* one Supream Being, *to which Dr. St contends that they referred the worship of their Inferiour Deities. Another notable Instance of his* unfaithfull reporting *a passage of* Thomas Aquinas; *and the* Generality *of the Heathens shown by most evident Arguments to have believed and worshipped a multitude of* Gods *properly so called and esteemed by them. What kind of* Notion *the* Vulgar Heathens *had of the* Divi-

XUM

nity *explained, and the* Parallel *between their worship, and that of the* Church *of* Rome *shewn to be* unjuſt, *and rejected as ſuch by Eminent Divines of the* Church *of* England. pag. 392.

The Fifth Dialogue.

The Dr's Parallel *from the Practice of the* Wiſer Heathens, *ſhewn to be* Unparallel *upon many accounts: and the Argument from* God's Appropriation *of certain external Acts to his worſhip, a meer* Sophiſm *made up of* Equivocations, Falſe Suppoſitions, *and* Self-contradictions, *and after all to* conclude *nothing againſt the doctrine of the* Church *of* Rome, *or the* definition *of Idolatry given by T. G.* p. 435

The Sixth Dialogue,

The Church of Rome *not juſtly chargeable either for not reſerving* any *External Act of* Religious worſhip *proper to* God, *or for giving any appropriate to God, to* Creatures. *The Dr. unhappy again in his citing of* Card. Lugo; *and his arguments from the* Text. Matth. 3. 10. *and the term,* Religious worſhip, *ſolved by his* own *diſtinctions. No ſuccour to his cauſe from the determination of* Circumſtances, *as aſſigned by him.*

Mr. Daillés *doctrine*, [*that* signs instituted by men to signify any thing, though of Religion, are to be interpreted by the publik Practice of those who use them,] *a very* Just Discharge *to the Dr's unjust Charge of* Idolatry, *in the particular Instances, of Invocation, Erecting Temples, burning Incense, &c. as they are practiced in the Church of Rome: and T. G's. Answer to the Dr's old Scruple*, why sacrifice may not be used to the Saints, in like manner as other External acts are, *shown to have been pertinent and satisfactory*, and his denying *Christ himself* to be offered, as a *Sacrifice* upon the *Altar*, shown to be repugnant to the *Sense* of the true and genuin *Sons* of the *Church* of *England*. A Friendly Advice *to him out of St. Augustin*. p. 464.

EXTRAICT DV PRIVILEGE du Roy.

PAr grace & Privilege du Roy, donné à Verſailles le 29. jour de Juillet, l'an de grace 1677. & de nôtre regne le 35. ſigné par le Roy en ſon Conſeil D'ALENCE', il eſt permis à RENE' GUIGNARD Marchand Libraire à Paris, de faire imprimer, vendre & debiter par tout le Royaume de France un Livre en Anglois intitulé *A Juſt Diſcharge to Dr Stillingfleet's unjuſt Charge of Idolatry againſt the Church of Rome*, id eſt, *Juſta confutatio injuſtæ accuſationis Doctoris Stillingfleeti, qua Romanam Eccleſiam Idolatriæ ream agere conatur*, en tel Volume & caractere que bon luy ſemblera, & ce pendant le temps de dix années entieres : Et deffenſes ſont faites à tous autres d'en vendre ny diſtribuer d'autre Impreſſion que de celle dudit RENE' GUIGNARD ſous peine de trois mille livres d'amande, confiſcation des Exemplaires, & de tous dépens, dommages & intereſt.

Regiſtré ſur le Livre de la Communauté le 9. Août 1677. E. COUTEROT Synd.

XUM